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SHELTER WAITLIST UPDATE: As of February 1st there are 1,196 people on the waitlist for shelter in San Francisco.

CA Threatens To Turn Back The Clock On Mental Health Care

Alex V Barnard

When it was passed in 1967, California’s Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act—which sets the legal requirements for involuntary commitments to psychiatric hospitals—was hailed as the “Magna Carta of the mentally ill.” The new rights and legal protections it created helped make California a leader in the deinstitutionalization of people living with mental illnesses. Now, the state is considering swinging the pendulum back towards custodial care. It should not turn back the clock lightly.

If “5150s”—the 72-hour holds that police or medical professionals can use to obligate someone deemed a risk to themselves or others to go to an emergency room for evaluation—have entered the popular lexicon, the proposed change concerns a much less known provision of LPS, “conservatorships.” Currently, if someone is hospitalized for a 72-hour 5150 and then a 14-day 5250, but remains unstable, an inpatient doctor can petition the court to allow them to keep a person longer. A court then determines whether the person is “gravely disabled,” that is, unable to meet their needs for food, clothing, or shelter.

According to state data, less than 2% of 5150s turn into conservatorships—for good reason. Once a conservator—usually a social worker in the county Department of Behavioral Health or Adult Services—is appointed, the conservator is able to determine where a person lives, to consent to have that person medicated, and to choose how their income (usually a social security check) gets spent. Most people under conservatorship are at least initially placed in a locked facility.

You would think that such a serious restriction of someone’s civil rights would be sharply scrutinized, but conservatorship has been a largely invisible part of the state’s mental health system. That is, until Senator Scott Wiener introduced SB 1045. The bill, signed by Governor Brown in October, would allow San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego to broaden the criteria of conservatorship to include homeless individuals with co-occurring substance...
TJ Johnston

proverbial mind of state.

With my rare, provocative,
I’m only getting started...
take a sip, have a taste…

This fire will burn, heal, infect and even intoxicate. Soothe yourself, stay awake,
Or softly whisper from my lips releasing nightmare lullabies.

forgiveness mercy and grace and for what it’s worth I apologize
Resurrecting the Goddess inside...I’ve been called and I’ve arrived.

Extracted from the womb of my soul I went through trauma while at my worst…
A Self-Mastered powerful, yet fierce epitome of the universe
How to breathe New Life...How to spiritually procreate.

Falling...Falling within myself only to learn how to levitate…
While walking up to the mirror struggling to take an honest look…
You helped me appreciate this journey and every step that I took
And yes you too!

And you…

SO WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN UP TO?

Deepest secrets to…
tears through the ones I glam on
From your lashes right to my face
Lashes on and behind my back
I found peace, it’s what I maintain

Unanswered questions
I found peace, it’s what I maintain

I heard every lash of them tongues
Lashes on and behind my back
From your lashes right to my face
to tears through the ones I glam on
to stay in tact...

Smiling into faces of those I thought I know…those who I loved and trusted my deepest secrets to...
My fear and insecurities, those who know my truth.
So called friends even family, those who look like you.
And you…
And yes you too!

You helped me appreciate this journey and every step that I took
While walking up to the mirror struggling to take an honest look..

I fear no more, I am healed,
without no pain, no gain,
Yes I acted up. Turn Down for What?
But Im no longer ashamed, No more self inflection...

Unanswered questions
I found peace, it’s what I maintain

Ducts of pain that laid so far beneath the surface of my skin as I’d make up my face
and embrace what dwelled within.

New Business Improvement District Expands War on the Poor

On Tuesday, February 5th, the Board of Supervisors will vote on a
resolution declaring their intention to establish a property-based business improvement district known as the “SoMa West Community Benefit District” and levy a multi-year assessment on all parcels in the district. This would allow private businesses to create a governing body that would likely be involved in policing the use of the space especially by poor and homeless folks.
Revisiting California’s 2018 Housing Progress

In January 2018, far reaching assembly bill 1506 progressed as the latest attempt by assembly member Richard Bloom of Santa Monica. Along with his peers, Bloom has vehemently committed himself to repealing the Costa-Hawkins Act of 1995, which he believes has strangled California’s housing stock for over two decades.

In a less than dramatic outcome, it lacked support to push through the first hearing. Republican Caucus members Steven Choi and Marc Steinorth opposed the measure, and have been vocal critics for some time. Only one supportive vote short, the bill would have likely made it through committee had Ed Chau and Jim Wood of the Democratic Caucus chosen to participate.

This decision, like many before it, come at odds with the realities of living in a state that has long favored homeowners and branded itself as one of the countries least affordable places to live. The tradition to protect profits over livelihood, even if the commodity is a necessity for survival, has perpetuated preexisting exclusionary practices specifically aimed at working class and people of color.

The historical struggle of housing insecurity seems only to slow during periods of increased regulation or financial downturn, suggesting a strong relationship between investment practices and market inflation. In fact, there have been more successful efforts at stripping tenant security than at strengthening, continuing to fuel speculative developers alike, not evidently dependent on the deaf to their neighbor’s cries for help.

Large-scale natural disasters further typcast California landlords as obstinate to compromise for the common good. Chico’s North Valley Property Owners Association, which opposed a temporary rent control ordinance to protect displaced victims of some 14,000 homes lost in Paradise, proved themselves tone deaf to their neighbor’s cries for compassion. The turmoil of those at risk of eviction or displacement are evidently dependent on the unscrupulous property management practices of landlordism and speculative developers alike, not underperforming market production.

Exemplary of this, housing oppression over the years has risen to unprecedented levels as homelessness and eviction rates skyrocket, becoming the most pressing public health crisis to date. With a statewide homeless population nearly the size of Pasadena, urban parks and underpasses have been informally subdivided at alarming rates as homeless encampments sprout to accommodate market failures.

The lack of affordability associated in cosmopolitan cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles inevitably spilled out into public discussion as an omnipresent multi-regional issue. There is no argument that homelessness is a problem that must be stopped. But, depending on who you talk to, homelessness is either a crime or a symptom of something much more inauspicious. This lack of continuity renders litigation at a standstill. To the housing activist and academic world, Bloom’s efforts presumed to die a quiet death by the hand of real estate cronies, as the nature of our political climate prevents housing from being both affordable and a lucrative investment.

In many ways 2018 acted as a tipping point in the war on classist housing policy. Almost immediately after the demise of Bloom’s AB 1506, grassroots movements began collecting signatures in an all out effort to breathe life into more pervasive repeal efforts during the midterm elections. Within months, Prop 10 collected nearly 600,000 signatures, establishing itself as a mainstream movement that breaks away from the orthodoxies of repressive housing policy.

With this growing legitimacy, the facts and misinformation spread pervasively as desperate efforts to shoot down the tentative legislation. Totaling in over $74 million, opposition to Prop 10 was primarily funded through wealthy developers and real estate investors. Under the veil No on Prop 10, Californians for Responsible Housing, a Coalition of Veterans, Seniors, Affordable Housing Providers, Social Justice Groups, Taxpayer Associations, and Labor; Sponsored by the California Apartment Association, levied claims that the bill would hurt communities of color, veterans, and aging communities were used to lever age the very emotions that would inspire support. This deceitful mimicry undermined informed political participation, the very justification for the existence of democracy.

If one thing is certain, Prop 10 was not a failure in the traditional sense. Although it did not pass, a formal foundation for meaningful change has been set for the future. Similar to the growth of Democratic Socialism in the 2016 primaries, conventional politics gave way to pragmatic non-partisan demands which have empowered working class suffrage on the left as well as the right.

Mainstream support from the City of San Francisco, California’s Democratic Party, Nurse’s Association, Alliance of Retired Americans, and the AIDS Healthcare Foundation have enriched the fight to regain local authority over housing. Groups like Tenants Together, San Francisco’s Tenants Union, Sacramento Tenants Union, and the Los Angeles Tenants Union have gained an immense presence on social media and in local participation.

2018 may have been the year Californians lost the housing rights battle, but they have not lost the war. Los Angeles County was able to pass a rental freeze ordinance, which temporarily protects uninorporated areas without any existing rent control. In Sacramento, a measure was placed on the midterm ballot to immediately regulate rental increases in the instance that Prop 10 were to have passed.

The undeniable truth is that change is coming. It is very clear that the overwhelming need to protect renters has the wealthiest in this state shaking in their boots. If the best tactic to keep rent control off ballots is to confuse voters, there will come a time when this will no longer work. With renters now making up the majority in most California cities, there are far more in the housing liberation movement than there are in positions of power. Their fear is justified, it is only a matter of time.

If you or someone you know wishes to get involved in local efforts to increase tenant protections, or needs supportive services due to housing related hardships, the list below are some of the most active tenants rights organizations in the state:

- Tenants Together
  474 Valencia St #36
  San Francisco, CA 94103
  (415) 495-8100

- San Francisco Tenants Union
  558 Capp St
  San Francisco, CA 94110
  (415) 282-6622

- Coalition On Homelessness
  468 Turk St
  San Francisco, CA 94102
  (415) 346-3740

- Oakland Tenants Union
  (510) 704-5276

- Sacramento Regional Coalition to End Homelessness
  333 Garden Hwy #100,
  Sacramento, CA 95833
  (916) 899-4367

- Sacramento Tenants Union
  530-564-6245

- Los Angeles Tenants Union
  (213) 986-8266

- California Coalition For Rural Housing
  717 K St #400,
  Sacramento, CA 95814
  (916) 443-4448

OBITUARY: Celebrating Aardvark Books

Derek Williams
One would notice Aardvark’s on a late afternoon jaunt down Church St at the edge of the Castro District right before one enters the Financial District, or downtown as it is more popularly known. According to a worker whom I spoke with, there will always be people that want to read and there will always be people that want to write. But he said that sci-fi has gained much more mainstream appeal since the 1970’s, and that before Star Wars came out sci-fi fandom was limited to scientists and seventh graders. Aardvarks was too crowded to host shows, or the store would have loved to try that.

Aardvark Books shut it’s doors for good on January 25th, after serving the community for 40 years.
A DAY AT THE COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS

Many of us have experienced that sinking feeling: the library book you checked out several weeks ago might be overdue, racking up late fines every day. But for those who can’t afford to pay the fines, the sinking feeling becomes worse: they can become blocked from accessing the library.

On January 17th, the San Francisco Public Library Commission voted to eliminate fines on overdue materials. The vote followed testimony from San Francisco residents and librarians in response to a report released by The Financial Justice Project and the Library titled “Long Overdue: Eliminating Fines on Overdue Materials to Improve Access to San Francisco Public Library.”

Through interviews with librarians across the country, surveys of library staff and patrons, and analysis of library data, the report finds that:

- Overdue fines disproportionately impact low-income people, African American communities, and San Franciscans without college degrees.

On January 17th, the San Francisco Public Library Commission voted to eliminate fines on overdue materials. The vote followed testimony from San Francisco residents and librarians in response to a report released by The Financial Justice Project and the Library titled “Long Overdue: Eliminating Fines on Overdue Materials to Improve Access to San Francisco Public Library.”

Through interviews with librarians across the country, surveys of library staff and patrons, and analysis of library data, the report finds that:

- Overdue fines disproportionately impact low-income people, African American communities, and San Franciscans without college degrees. Library patrons across the city - regardless...
A DAY AT THE COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS

Oliver Northwood

Miguel has been working with CalT for 20 years. He used to be homeless.

I believe that outreach is the main tool in this organization. This is the only way we can communicate with the homeless people of the city. We want to know what is going on in their lives, and have them report to us and let us know how we can solve their problems, together.

Living on the street is really hard when you have PTSD. Pretty much everyone in the homeless population has PTSD or some other kind of disability. We have disabilities because we have long histories.

Miguel left up when he explained how CalT’s efforts were paying off.

We’re working on getting an insurance. We got the money.

We worked so hard, we fought so hard, and we secured the money.

The Coalition on Homelessness is tackling an issue that hurts all of us.

The solution is surprisingly obvious: HOMES.

They have sold, smart plans to make this happen. They need your help.

We can choose to live in a world where everyone has a roof, a bed.

Overdue fines are not an effective tool to encourage returns. None of the libraries across the country that have eliminated overdue fines have experienced increases in late returns, longer hold times, or gaps in collections. In fact, some libraries saw their late-return rates drop following fine elimination. While overdue fines will be eliminated, patrons that do not return their books will still need to either replace, or pay for the value of, any materials that are not returned.

- Research shows there are more effective tools to encourage people to return books. The report recommends several administrative changes to help increase the library’s return rate, including sending out more reminders, and shortening the time frame before a book needs to be replaced or paid for.

- Eliminating overdue fines will increase access to the library. Once someone starts accruing overdue fines, their account can be blocked, restricting them from checking out library materials. Approximately 5% of all library cardholders have their cards blocked exclusively due to overdue fines.

The proposal will go to the Board of Supervisors next for a vote, likely as part of the June budget process. The recommended reform endorsed by Mayor London Breed, who said: “As a City, we need to make sure that we are not placing unnecessary burdens on people to access our public resources. In this case, the fines and fees are overwhelmingly affecting people in our community from disadvantaged backgrounds, which undermines the goal of the Library and reinforces inequality in our City.”

Of income - miss return deadlines at similar rates. However, patrons in low-income areas face much more difficulty in paying the fines associated with overdue items. As a result, overdue fines can widen existing inequalities. It is a percent of Bayview’s adult cardholders are blocked from accessing library materials, more than three times as many as in high-income locations. Across the city, branches that serve lower-income populations have a greater share of blocked patrons.

- Overdue fines are not an effective tool to encourage returns. None of the libraries across the country that have eliminated overdue fines have experienced increases in late returns, longer hold times, or gaps in collections. In fact, some libraries saw their late-return rates drop following fine elimination. While overdue fines will be eliminated, patrons that do not return their books will still need to either replace, or pay for the value of, any materials that are not returned.

- Research shows there are more effective tools to encourage people to return books. The report recommends several administrative changes to help increase the library’s return rate, including sending out more reminders, and shortening the time frame before a book needs to be replaced or paid for.

- Eliminating overdue fines will increase access to the library. Once someone starts accruing overdue fines, their account can be blocked, restricting them from checking out library materials. Approximately 5% of all library cardholders have their cards blocked exclusively due to overdue fines.

The proposal will go to the Board of Supervisors next for a vote, likely as part of the June budget process. The recommended reform endorsed by Mayor London Breed, who said: “As a City, we need to make sure that we are not placing unnecessary burdens on people to access our public resources. In this case, the fines and fees are overwhelmingly affecting people in our community from disadvantaged backgrounds, which undermines the goal of the Library and reinforces inequality in our City.”

- Overdue fines are not an effective tool to encourage returns. None of the libraries across the country that have eliminated overdue fines have experienced increases in late returns, longer hold times, or gaps in collections. In fact, some libraries saw their late-return rates drop following fine elimination. While overdue fines will be eliminated, patrons that do not return their books will still need to either replace, or pay for the value of, any materials that are not returned.

- Research shows there are more effective tools to encourage people to return books. The report recommends several administrative changes to help increase the library’s return rate, including sending out more reminders, and shortening the time frame before a book needs to be replaced or paid for.

- Eliminating overdue fines will increase access to the library. Once someone starts accruing overdue fines, their account can be blocked, restricting them from checking out library materials. Approximately 5% of all library cardholders have their cards blocked exclusively due to overdue fines.

The proposal will go to the Board of Supervisors next for a vote, likely as part of the June budget process. The recommended reform endorsed by Mayor London Breed, who said: “As a City, we need to make sure that we are not placing unnecessary burdens on people to access our public resources. In this case, the fines and fees are overwhelmingly affecting people in our community from disadvantaged backgrounds, which undermines the goal of the Library and reinforces inequality in our City.”
IT’S A BIG DEAL: NEWSOM’S HOUSING BUDGET, EXPLAINED

Not that his plan includes everything (more on that later), but collectively Newsom’s proposals reveal that housing and homelessness will be at the forefront of his legislative agenda, and will not take a backseat to other campaign promises such as universal health care or early childhood education. At least not yet.

No governor in recent memory has proposed this big a budget boost for housing and homelessness

It takes a lot of money to build housing reserved for lower-income Californians—roughly $330,000 per unit, by one estimate. Affordable housing and homelessness advocates have been complaining for years that they are receiving nowhere near the level of financial support they need from the state.

Newsom’s budget proposals include a major infusion of more than $2 billion in one-time and ongoing affordable housing cash. That includes:

- $500 million in one-time cash for local governments to combat homelessness—of that, $500 million will go towards regional planning, and $200 million as awards for cities that build new shelters or permanent supportive housing.
- A quintupling of ongoing cash (from $80 million to $500 million) for the state’s most important low-income housing financing tool, the low-income housing tax credit.
- $500 million in one-time cash for “moderate-income” housing production, or the so-called “missing middle” of housing for California’s middle class, Newsom said he has also urged Silicon Valley firms to match this funding.
- $25 million to get more homeless Californians on federal disability programs.

I have never seen this kind of attention paid in the budget to homelessness and affordable housing issues,” said Anya Lawler, a housing policy advocate for the Western Center on Law and Poverty. “Just the page count alone is a little unprecedented.”

Newsom also said he would appoint a new homelessness czar in the next few days to help coordinate state, regional and local initiatives. Included in the budget is a policy tweak that would allow new homeless shelters to avoid prolonged environmental reviews—a regulatory hurdle that often holds up new housing plans.

Affordable housing advocates caution that they’re waiting to see details—especially how much will actually go towards the production of new housing.

Newsom threatened cities that aren’t building enough housing— and cities are nervous

Cities and the NIMBY homeowners who populate them are often blamed as the biggest obstacle to producing more low-income and market-rate housing.

To incentivize cities to approve more projects, Newsom has proposed $500 million in awards to cities and counties that meet new, short-term housing goals.

The housing quotas assigned to local governments are often laughably flawed. Beverly Hills, for example, met its state-mandate affordable housing target last year with three measly low-income units.

Newsom wants to revamp the whole housing-goal setting process. Statewide, the goals are being set higher than what they used to be. That $500 million is the carrot, and most cities are eager to revamp the seemingly senseless way in which they’re assigned housing quotas. But along with that carrot could be a thorny stick.

Newsom proposes taking away transportation funding—including revenue generated by the recently enacted gas tax—from cities that fail to meet longer-term housing goals.

Newsom threatened cities that aren’t building enough housing—and they are nervous

Cites are not happy. They say much of housing production is out of their control, and dependent on market conditions and developer proclivities.

“You can’t set a goal that’s not achievable, and then penalize us with transportation dollars that aren’t there,” said Jason Rhine, assistant legislative director for the League of California Cities.

Left unmentioned: rent control, zoning reform, and that pesky ‘3.5 million units’ promise

One number that didn’t make its way into Newsom’s first budget: 3.5 million. That’s how many new homes he has pledged California will build under his watch—a number that most housing experts say is unrealistic. The Newsom administration did not publicly estimate how many new units his new proposals would generate— perhaps an indication that the new governor is distancing himself from the figure.

Also missing from the budget or the governor’s comments: any reference to rent control or stronger tenant protections, despite his earlier pledge that he would try to broker a compromise. In fairness, the budget unveiling might not be the appropriate venue to talk about that. But a source briefed on the budget said that while Newsom’s team expressed enthusiasm for legislators to take up rent control, they weren’t leading on the issue.

Newsom may be taking a wait-and-see approach on the most controversial piece of housing legislation he’ll encounter this year: an attempt to force cities to allow apartment buildings to be built around transit stops. San Francisco Democratic state Sen. Scott Wiener’s second attempt at “zoning reform”—which would strip cities of their ability to block denser housing in areas previously reserved for single family homes—will need Newsom’s support to actually become law.

When asked about Wiener’s new legislation, Newsom said he hadn’t read it yet—the same response he gave to questions about last year’s bill during the campaign. But he did say he “appreciates the spirit” of the bill.

CALmatters.org is a nonprofit, nonpartisan media venture explaining California policies and politics.
The Threat of Expanding Conservatorship

continued from page 1...

abuse and mental disorders and who use a high volume of emergency services, as marked by eight 5150s in the last year.

Wiener heralded the bill as a means of “getting people off our streets and into housing and services that will help them get healthy.” It’s not clear why Wiener is confident that expanding conservatorship will help people “get healthy”, because the state collects no data on who goes into conservatorship or what the outcomes are. What I have learned as part of a research project interviewing conservators around the state is that most think that conservatorship is an extreme measure that should be reserved for the sickest of the sick, which is why many are concerned about expanding it.

In fact, SB 1045 seems to be, on a broad scale, the wrong solution for the problems that the state faces. The state is not well equipped to deal with the needs of people who are not in mental health hospitals; it does not have the resources and facilities to deal with such a large increase in the number of people who need services. The state is overwhelmed by the number of people who need services, and expanding conservatorship will only exacerbate the problem.

One 2009 study found that, in 2008 conservatorship hearings, the judge only ruled against establishing conservatorship in one case.

Advocates are rightly worried that SB 1045 will siphon funds away from voluntary and community-based services. The law does require that cities establish that “no voluntary mental health programs... may be reduced as a result of the implementation” of the bill. But San Francisco’s claim that this is the case is non-sensical. The people targeted for expanded conservatorship—which it says number between 55 and 103—jump to the front of the queue for scarce places in permanent supportive housing, others who are trying to access housing are, obviously, bumped back.

People rightly want to see changes to California’s mental health system, particularly to meet the needs of individuals whose severe, co-occurring mental illnesses and substance abuse disorders are aggravated by our collective failure to provide them a dignified and stable place to live. But attacking the LPS Act for too far misses that the system that the signers of this “Magna Carta” was never built. A comprehensive system of voluntary, culturally-competent, and comprehensive services has never existed; it’s a bit premature to abandon a vision that’s never been seriously tried.
In yet another magical moment in a string of magical moments since we began our journey to pass Our City Our Home (OCOH), the revenue measure that doubles the city’s homeless efforts, the city received $415 million in unanticipated revenue. This was two years’ worth of Educational Revenue Augmentation fund or ERAF, which is basically excess property tax that goes to the state and back to us.

The Our City Our Home Coalition is recommending that $171.4 million of that go to properly begin implementing November 2018’s Prop C “Our City Our Home,” which passed with over 60% approval, but is held up in court.

This windfall is poised to fund numerous “shovel ready” projects and begin tackling the homelessness crisis this year. $171.4 million provides 875 homeless housing units, 540 shelter beds, behavioral health services for 397 individuals, and homeless prevention services for 3,100 households. In line with Prop C, the OCOH Coalition is calling for 20% of housing to go to youth and 25% to go to families, through both 100% homeless housing and set-aside units in affordable housing buildings. San Francisco and its residents suffering on our streets cannot afford to wait until the lawsuit is settled.

Expand Funding to meet City needs: The Our City Our Home Coalition strongly recommends the City of San Francisco “grow the pot” of available revenue to fund homelessness services as well as other pressing civic needs. This could be accomplished through funding sources listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current ERAF Funding</th>
<th>$185,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Time Rainy Day Fund</td>
<td>$52,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 16/17 ERAF discretionary +rainy</td>
<td>$56,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 19/20 ERAF discretionary +rainy</td>
<td>$112,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$405,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposals: There are two proposals before the Board of Supervisors – one from Mayor and the other from Supervisor Peskin. Both have matching funding for homelessness, except Peskin’s does not have funding for bathrooms, and his homeless proposals are for two years funding while Mayor Breed is for four years. However, neither of the proposals fund solutions for homeless families or youth, nor do they have funding for community mental health or prevention of homelessness. The proposals are also leaving money on the table. Neither fully take advantage of funding sources listed above – Supervisor Peskin’s proposal is about $10 million more than Mayor Breed’s, but still leaves $40 million in new rainy day funds on the table. The Peskin Proposal also has funding for childcare, teachers and PG&E power plant acquisition, while the Mayor’s does not. We have been resisting being pitted against these other needs – calling for prioritization of homeless funding and asking the city to “grow the pot” to meet other needs.

COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS IS HIRING!

We are currently hiring for our Human Rights Organizer position. The work group works to defend the human rights of homeless people, people on the streets and in shelters.

For more information about the position and the requirements, visit http://www.coalitiononhomelessness.org/careers. Preference will be given to San Francisco residents who have personally experienced poverty and homelessness. People of color and others who have experienced discrimination are encouraged to apply.

If interested, please send resume and cover letter to jfriedenbach@cohsf.org by Wednesday Feb 13th.