What Is Grants Pass Outlawing, and Why Does it Matter?
The City of Grants Pass defines camping as sleeping with a blanket or other covering. If the court sides with Grants Pass, it will give US cities the green light to further criminalize basic activities necessary for survival: sleeping, sitting, standing, eating, and more.

Camps are part of a cycle that deepens poverty and trauma, and impacts are magnified for Black and Brown people, LGBTQ+ folks, immigrants, and Disabled people. Criminal records acquired while surviving unhoused prevent access to the minimal economic and housing support programs available – prolonging homelessness. Sweeps and related citations, fines, and arrests, in other words, are massive barriers to moving out of homelessness.

Where Does the Grants Pass Law Come From?
Thousands of laws like the one in Grants Pass exist in cities across the US. Today's laws have evolved from historical laws banning particular people from public space.

For decades, Grants Pass was a "Sundown Town," a town that prohibited the presence of non-white people after dark. In fact, Grants Pass leaders explicitly targeted the act of sleeping while terrorizing Black, Brown, and Indigenous people in editorials like this one:

**Homelessness is a Systemic Problem**

Homelessness is not a choice. It is a status resulting from years of policy decisions prioritizing profit over people. Since 1994, for example, the US government has gotten rid of 480,000 units of public housing. Rather than eradicating homelessness, governments try to eradicate unhoused people. Criminalizing homelessness fails to address systemic causes of mass homelessness, exacerbates underlying structures of oppression, and drains communities of capacity to build toward better futures.

**Our Demands**

1. End the practice of sweeping encampments: towing homeless people’s vehicles, stealing their belongings, and destroying the structures they create to keep themselves and their communities safe from the elements.
2. End the criminalization of homeless people, by ending the practices of move-along orders, harassment, ticketing and arresting homeless people for existing outside!
3. Create and fund actual public health interventions, including harm reduction, sanitation, and others that appropriately respond to the needs of poor and homeless people!
4. Provide adequate funding for the development and maintenance of housing units and the preservation of existing housing for poor and homeless people!
5. End the practice of тампов losses from yesterday’s Sundown Towns to today’s Sweeps!

For more information visit wraphome.org/targeted-banished-displace-sweep/

Email: wrap@wraphome.org

**WRITING:** Write about your experience of homelessness in San Francisco, about policies you think the City should put in place or change, your opinion on local issues, or about something newsworthy happening in your neighborhood!

**ARTWORK:** Help transform ART into ACTION by designing artwork for STREET SHEET! We especially love art that uplifts homeless people, celebrates the power of community organizing, or calls out abuses of power!

Visit www.streetsheet.org/submit-your-writing/or-bring-submissions-to-280-turk-street

**ORGANIZE WITH US**

**HOUSING JUSTICE WORKING GROUP**

**TUESDAYS@12 Noon**
The Housing Justice Workgroup is working toward a San Francisco in which every human being can have and maintain decent, habitable, safe, and secure housing. This meeting is in English and Spanish and open to everyone! Email mecarrer@cohsf.org to get involved!

**HUMAN RIGHTS WORKING GROUP**

**WEDNESDAYS@12:30**
The Human Rights Workgroup has been doing some serious heavy lifting on these issues: conducting direct research, outreach to people on the street, running multiple campaigns, developing policy, staging direct actions, capturing media attention, and so much more. All those down for the cause are welcome to join! Email lpierce@cohsf.org

**EVERYONE IS INVITED TO JOIN OUR WORKING GROUP MEETINGS!**
I recently hate-watched "Why San Francisco Is Broken And How To Fix It," the cringe leopard-style gamew show. It was produced by Together SF Action, a wing-right group that wants to give the mayor even more power than she has right now, and wants the city to work only for the well-heeled and privileged. It was extremely difficult to sit through all the misinformation about our governmental structure, but one category concerning "countless commissions" got my blood boiling. The clue was, "This notable city department is overseen by four separate commissions/committees." The response was, "What is the Department of Homelessness?" Of all the errors throughout the program, not referring to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) by its entire name was especially laughable.

The show claimed that four separate bodies oversee the department: the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee, the Our City Our Home Oversight Committee, the Local Homeless Coordinating Board and the Homelessness Oversight Commission. Only the last one actually oversees HSH.

The show also claimed that there are 130 boards and commissions making big decisions in California, but without accountability to voters, like some appointed shadow government that calls the shots without the mayor's consent or the citizenry. Together SF Action's efforts to put a ballot measure on the November ballot on the number of commissions to 65.

In fact, commissions—especially oversight and advisory commissions—play a key role in increasing transparency, bringing equity and fostering civic engagement in this city. I speak as a person who has served on an advisory commission, passed recommendations at the advisory level, called for the disbandment, and saw the problems of the commission and called for its disbandment.

In San Francisco, we elect 11 supervisors as a legislative branch, and a mayor as an executive branch. While the supervisors and mayor deal with municipal affairs and have plenty of aides to deal with the various issues facing the city, they can only do so much, so we or an adverse body in specific department or issue that may be important but not ready for prime time. However, one important fact is that commissions cannot veto legislation or mayoral directives.

I know that many of these appointed bodies or various names like "commission," "board," "committee" or "task force," but I will use the term "commission" as a catch-all. I will also focus on two main types of commissions: oversight and advisory.

The oversight commission is the power commission, which is distinct from the other kind in that it has some power over a department or entity, but may be an advisory body that makes decisions on one's legal interests, and requires its members to file a statement of economic interest called a Form 700 to avoid conflicts of interest. The sole commission of this type related to homelessness is the Homelessness Oversight Commission—its powers include, but are not limited to, approving budgets, formulating annual long term goals, establishing performance standards and conducting performance audits of service delivery. Oversight commissions associated with other departments have similar mandates, and may include policy setting and advisement on legislation. However, if a commission has policy-making power, it may never countermand existing federal, state or local laws, nor veto legislation passed by the Board of Supervisors. If somebody is dissatisfied with decisions made at any commission, they may always lobby the supervisors to pass a law.

On the other hand, the advisory commission has no power at all, except recommending personnel to their appointing bodies, who in turn have final say on whether these recommendations move forward. There are four bodies dealing with HSH issues: the Local Homeless Coordinating Board, which deals with matters that are federally mandated or funded; the Our City Our Home Oversight Commission, which provides recommendations on spending tax revenues from the homelessness gross receipts tax, passed as Proposition C in November 2018; and the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee, both of which make recommendations on various issues within the shelter system. As I have covered in a previous article, there is no advisory commission that deals with permanent supportive housing, and which is sorely needed.

I served on the city's SRO Task Force, which was an advisory commission dealing with issues around single resident occupancy hotels, both private and nonprofit. I successfully introduced and passed two recommendations: one around gender neutral common bathrooms at SROs, and the other calling for PSH tenants to pay only 30% of their income toward rent. Both became city ordinances. However, the commission had many efficacy issues that I had addressed in a previous article, and I called for its disbandment. The commission sunsets at the end of 2021, after two years of dormancy.

It should be noted that the Board of Supervisors creates many advisory commissions, and that according to Section 2.21 of the board's Rules of Order, all advisory bodies must sunset within three years unless renewed. But, renewal of advisory commissions has become a mere formality rather than an opportunity to provide meaningful oversight and to judge whether or not the commission is truly providing recommendations and addressing emerging issues within its subject matter jurisdiction.

Both oversight commissions and advisory commissions are bound by the state Brown Act and the City's Sunshine Ordinance, which require that meetings be open to the public and that public comment be taken. It is important that we bring this initiative to a deeper dive into policy areas, and that civic engagement be enhanced.

So, what do we do? I believe that, except for the "income, and continue to fight for our rights. She can be reached at Strightnow@gmail.com
The following transcript is an interview with Jennifer Friedenbach, executive director of the Coalition on Homelessness. The episode dropped on April 18, before the U.S. Supreme Court started hearing the case of Grants Pass v. Johnson. It has been edited for brevity, clarity and style.

KENDALL CIESEMIER: On April 22, the Supreme Court will hear the case of Grants Pass v. Johnson. This will be the most significant court case about the rights of homeless people in decades. About 1.6 million American households are at risk of losing their homes, and the Potomac Center on Homelessness and Housing, a non-profit in San Francisco, is representing a plaintiff in the case. Jennifer Friedenbach is the executive director of the Coalition on Homelessness. Jennifer, welcome to "At Liberty," and thank you so much for joining me.

I want to start with the case at hand, which is Grants Pass v. Johnson. It's going to be argued next week. We'll get a decision later this year in June.

When you heard the case was headed to the Supreme Court, what were your first thoughts?

JENNIFER: Yeah, I was surprised and then I was really worried because the Supreme Court didn't take this up the first time, but it's really such a political court and since Fox News has been kind of using homelessness as a way to try to shame Democratic stronghold in major cities that it has become so political.

And so I think that's probably why they took it up.

KENDALL: That makes sense. Usually they like to take up things that are kind of going on in the public discourse. A discussion in this case is whether or not people can sleep outside without punishment.

What does that look like as it exists today? What are your city governments like currently allowed to do?

JENNIFER: First of all, not all city governments are following the law as it is, which is why there's so many lawsuits on this. They can still do operations in terms of removing encampments for health code violations, if someone's blocking a sidewalk, I mean, all these different kinds of things.

Really, it's a very narrow right, but a really important right, and this is that they can't cite or arrest people for lodging or, like, sleeping on the sidewalk if they haven't offered shelter first. And so if it's really kind of creates pressure on these municipalities to address the issue instead of just kind of pushing people around and violating their rights.

So, they're also not supposed to be taking people's property and throwing it away. And so there's protections that people enjoy that are, at a point in their lives where they're really experiencing, a devastating situation where they have lost their housing, and then to have the city governments kind of them stomp all over them.

It feels like for homeless people to be kicked when you're down, frankly. And so this, these little rights at least create a little bit of protection for them against these actions.

KENDALL: Kicking you when you're down is such a good way of putting it and we see this across so many disciplines. This is something we've seen in public policy or so many different areas that we work on at the ACLU. But I want to dig in a little bit to encampments because I think encampments have, with the pandemic and subsequent am- plification of our housing crisis, grown to exist in many American cities beyond kind of historically where they existed in the American West to speak to. And as you mentioned, they've become this sort of political hot potato.

People are talking about encampments and city officials are facing a lot of public pressure. Sometimes they're being asked to remove encamp- ments. What do you make of the public pressure? Why is this happening now? What do you want people to know about the kind of pressure that they're putting on city officials?

JENNIFER: Yeah, I mean, folks are really frustrated, right?

I mean, they're frustrated. There's a group of people who are completely destitute that don't have access to sanitation, hygiene, bathrooms, water and folks are frustrated. Nobody's as frustrated, of course, as homeless people themselves who are experiencing this humanitarian crisis that is hurting them and taking years off their lives.

And so, but if people don't have anywhere to go, it doesn't solve the root issue of why is there so much of this differential in housing opportunity and rents that this huge disparity between income and the cost of housing across the country, but really significant on the West, up and down the West Coast. And so when the government comes in and they say, okay, we're just going to move people, it hurts ev- erybody because you're basically wasting resources that could be better spent on solutions.

It also erodes trust in city government because you don't have a real response. You have this kind of performatve fake kind of use of force but what it does do, what we, we do know it does is, is that it lengthens homelessness because when they take people's prop- erty they lose their paperwork.

They lose contact with social workers that are connecting them with services. People fees with being evicted, fees that they can't pay. Court dates that they miss because they don't have an address to receive the notifications. They get warrants out for their arrests, and it creates this pauper's prison in San Francisco, 40 percent of our jail population is unhoused.

And then when people have warrants, they get kicked off of public housing wait lists. I mean, it's really something that creates this problem. One, the roots of this are very, very, very extensive, and two, the response that was legislated has been really perfunctory.

In 2013, when the city asked, it's, it really is where these intersections of oppression are elevated and are centered in our discussion. We really do need to be consistent in that and the Coalition on Homelessness does love.

KENDALL: I want to focus on San Francisco for a second. So I'll use San Francisco as an example, but I think you could speak to this in other cities or is addressing something that's happening in Northern California and the Greater Bay Area in particular?

JENNIFER: I think we're seeing it in all Bay Area communities against the city of San Francisco.

What can you tell me about that? Can you give me an example, what are you all filing or just what we're seeing in the Bay Area?

JENNIFER: Yeah, definitely. So for years, we were trying to get some decent policies in place for the city to work with the city to establish a human right to housing and effective— that is, really a human right—to getting people off the response.

We got some pretty decent policies, and I think our position is that the local people's property because they're not leaving a notice, and they have a certain kind of a public trust, people's level of frustration gets higher and you do get this negative response, and so the judge ended up issuing an order that the city basically said that the city was following the law.

So one of the things that we found was the city designed forms to evade this, where they have enough shelter beds by having this binary choice for people who are—they are, you have a notice, you have a certain amount of time to leave a notice, and they have a certain amount of time to come and pick it up, that we have a process for leading with a shelter mandate.

KENDALL: Thank you for laying that out there.

I think that some folks might be listening and think, wow, this is unusual for the ACLU to be involved in this, to be talking about something like a shelter mandate or an eviction. But I think the in- terconnection that you just described is exactly why we are involved. It is really the root of the conversation that's disproportionately impacting communities that we fight for their rights.

So whether that's women, people of color, you named a plethora of folks. I also think that what you said about it being a visual representation, the kind of social policy that still exist, the hate that still exists. You also listed a number of stigmas and misconceptions about the population of people who experience homelessness.

Why do you think we still have such stigmas? And really, what do we do away at the stigma?

JENNIFER: I think part of it is kind of a lack of recognition of, I mean, we're talking across different kinds of social protection, disability, sexism, disablism, for the most part, kind of unacceptable. Right?

And then it creates a scapegoat for policy. And then those misconceptions end up in the public discourse. And when you have a policy that's based on public trust in a solution, people's level of frustration gets higher and higher. And they get to this point because it's such a vital issue.

"I'm just OK with anything, just get them out of my face, just get that huge piece of it. It's pretty early scientific studies on what kind of impact do you see in San Francisco?"

How we overcome it, I think, is the other issues is that we really humanize the voices of folks who are overrepresented and are centered in our discussion. We really need to be consistent in that.

KENDALL: I want to focus on San Francisco. San Francisco has filed a number of lawsuits before or is addressing something that's happening in Northern California and the Greater Bay Area in particular. The Coalition on Homelessness does love.

What can you tell me about that? Can you give me an example, what are you all filing or just what we're seeing in the Bay Area?

JENNIFER: Yeah, definitely. So for years, we were trying to get some decent policies in place for the city to work with the city to establish a human right to housing and effective— that is, really a human right—to getting people off the response.

We got some pretty decent policies, and I think our position is that the local people's property because they're not leaving a notice, and they have a certain kind of a public trust, people's level of frustration gets higher and you do get this negative response, and so the judge ended up issuing an order that the city basically said that the city was following the law.

So one of the things that we found was the city designed forms to evade this, where they have enough shelter beds by having this binary choice for people who are—they are, you have a notice, you have a certain amount of time to leave a notice, and they have a certain amount of time to come and pick it up, that we have a process for leading with a shelter mandate.

KENDALL: Thank you for laying that out there.

I think that some folks might be listening and think, wow, this is unusual for the ACLU to be involved in this, to be talking about something like a shelter mandate or an eviction. But I think the in- terconnection that you just described is exactly why we are involved. It is really the root of the conversation that's disproportionately impacting communities that we fight for their rights.
SCOTUS WILL DECIDE IF HOMELESSNESS CAN BE PUNISHED

The following transcript is an interview with Jennifer Friedenbach, executive director of the Coalition on Homelessness, on At Liberty, the podcast of the American University.

JENNIFER: Of course, he couldn’t use that. And then they disappear.

KENDALL: He really wanted to get off the streets. He was elderly. He

needed to get off the streets. They swoop in with this use

of police, disdain for unhoused communities underlying racism, homophobia,

transphobia, classism, ableism. The reason that we do this is because we didn’t do the things that needed to be done. In fact, we

then the city aspiring for a police force to potentially even enact brutality, I

think that we’ve seen a lot.

In Francisco for a second. So I’ll use the Grants Pass case that another case that the ACLU coalition on Homelessness are

suing the city of San Francisco is a plaintiff in a lawsuit in Grants Pass, how it relates to the Grants Pass lawsuit with the ACLU of

Oregon. For years, we were trying policies so that we have very few people are taking homeless people where we have very few people are taking homeless people

then that guy is left out on the streets. So, the neighbors who are

complaining about that guy being there, don’t have their issues resolved.

He doesn’t have his issues resolved. And we just spent a ton of money on something that got us nowhere.

KENDALL: It seems like a lot of government inefficiency, which

I think pretty much everyone can kind of buy into “how do we

make the government more efficient?” How do you make local
government, state government work for you on these kinds of issues? This case is going on at the same time as the Grants
Pass case.

The city has actually used the Grants Pass case to try to block the lawsuit. What is the interconnectedness between this national case, Grants Pass, the decision that we’ll hear in June, and how it

will impact the case with the city of San Francisco?

JENNIFER: In our lawsuit, we actually have 13 different claims, but this particular one around cruel and unusual punishment is one of them.

This idea that if folks have no other choice but to be homeless, then the municipality shouldn’t be able to cite and arrest them.

That is one of our claims that the city is violating, and that is what’s up in front of the Supreme Court. And so if they decide to overturn it, what it means is that—basically the municipalities are free to cite and arrest people who have no other choice but to be on the streets.

Yeah, and that doesn’t totally kill our lawsuit, but obviously has an impact on one of our claims. And I feel like this particular right creates a pressure on the city, this idea that they have to provide at least some modicum of services for folks, that if it disappears is really a problem.

Of course the whole idea of cruel and unusual—who knows what the Supreme Court will do—but there’s a lot at stake for everybody who’s kind of protected around cruel and unusual punishment for not being punished for who they are. And so it’s like many of these things.

It really has a broad effect on everyone’s civil rights.

KENDALL: And conversely, if the Supreme Court were to decide it is cruel and unusual punishment to punish folks who are sleeping outside because they have no other place to go, that I imagine would strengthen the case that you all have existing against the city of San Francisco. Is that correct?

JENNIFER: Yeah, absolutely. This for us is almost like a crown.

The idea of criminalization opening up this kind of broader authority for a police force to potentially even enact brutality, I

think that we’ve seen a lot.

In the past number of years, police brutality has become a very notable and seen and spoken about issue, which is great. How does the increase of criminalization of homeless folks intersect with police authority or the ability for police to use force that would then yield really dire circumstances or impacts?

JENNIFER: Yeah, the big picture is that this mass episode of homelessness is our second big mass homelessness in the United States since the Great Depression. And it’s extended for decades because we didn’t do the things that needed to be done. In fact, we went in the opposite direction and cut our housing by 76 percent at the federal level.

Then this huge humanitarian crisis is kind of laid at the feet of the municipal government, [which] has then used police as a primary response to homelessness. So, if there’s an unhoused person out

continues on page 6...
in front of my home, whether I’m concerned about them and want to get them help, or I want them gone, if I call the city, they’re going to send out a police officer.

It’s about 15 percent of police calls. Because we have a large number of police officers responding to homelessness, and so just homeless complaints alone are between 70,000 and 90,000 per year in San Francisco, this creates, obviously, a huge problem in terms of the opportunity for officer-involved use of force.

In San Francisco, almost all of our officer-involved fatalities, along with even shootings, have been a large portion of people who are mentally ill, a large portion is African Americans, and they intersect around housing status. And in terms of increased risk of officer-involved shootings has been of some body who’s out in the open.

So it really amplifies these inequities that people face. We also have a lot of situations around illegal searches and seizures. A lot more arrests around drug arrests and possession, and all these other things that happen because these folks are on the streets, and people with police for who are out on the streets because they don’t have that protection of a door.

They don’t have their own home, and so basically everything is all kind of out in the open.

KENDALL: So much of this seems like we’re dealing more with a bad situation, where we end up spending money kind of down the road to deal with the aftermath of a bad situation, as opposed to investing money kind of closer to the source of the problems. Before someone is experiencing homelessness.

Before the police are called. Before a person is arrested from all of these things that can kind of play out in this path. I’m curious: what are you at the Coalition for Homelessness advocating for currently that really seeks to address the root causes of homelessness?

JENNIFER: Yeah, and you’re absolutely right. It literally costs more to keep people homeless than it would to just put them in housing. Most of these costs are around medical care.

Yeah, it’s really important for folks to know. Also, police and other things, starvation, etc. But the primary is in the healthcare costs. Homeless people present as 25 years older their calendar year. So, me as a 50-year-old woman— I’m not, but let’s pretend I’m 50 would present medically as a 75-year-old in terms of increased risk of diabetes rates, heart disease, all the things that go along with that responsiveness.

It really wreaks havoc. So we’re dealing with at the Coalition for Homelessness, we really follow national best standards in terms of what we advocate for. Every community can follow the same, and many communities across the country don’t currently have that really well and having a lot of success.

But you want to right-size your system. As we talk to unhoused folks, one of the first things they say is in terms of what you want us to work on is, really, “[it] would have been great if I could have been prevented from being homeless in the first place.” A lot of times, it’s just a short-term subsidy.

Maybe they’re doing pickup labor and by the time we come to do the, you know, a lot of times it’s just a short-term subsidy through

a struggle with cancer would have kept them in their housing. Or maybe they’re on a fixed income and they have a disability or they’re a senior and their rent’s rising up above their income and all of these things where the person’s life would have kept them in housing.

But we really need to prevent people from becoming homeless in the first place. And then once they become homeless and we don’t prevent it, then we have shelters so that they don’t end up on the streets. Shelter is not appropriate for everyone, but it’s appropriate for some folks, and they get in and then the negative consequences of the streets don’t affect them, but we want to get them out of shelter as quickly as possible.

You don’t want people stuck in shelter, and then you do that by having housing that’s affordable to them, and we don’t have to build all that housing. That’s not necessary. We don’t need the shelter, of course. We should fully utilize all our public housing stock, but we can also acquire buildings.

We can take tourist hotels and convert them into housing. We can also pay subsidies in the private market, so people can have support services. The person needs the extra support services. They need housing. They need those in the streets of the homeless.

So in San Francisco, for example, we’ve got some matching money from the state, and we have an initiative that we put on the ballot.

That’s called Prop C. And we were able to, in a really short period of time, get about 1500 affordable units. And we also got a lot almost a thousand, nine hundred affordable units in the private market. People usually think about as Section 8, but they now call them “housing choice vouchers” from the federal government.

We were able to get all, use all of those and get all of those folks in housing in San Francisco at our rental prices. There’s so much that can happen, that we can do to address this issue. It’s going to save money and resources, but we have to prioritize investments at the local, state, and federal level.

In San Francisco, our budget to solve homelessness is only five and a half percent of our total city budget. That is not enough. That is not nearly enough. It’s a no. 1 issue in San Francisco and in cities across the country.

KENDALL: You sit in the kind of hotbed of this issue in a lot of ways. I think nationally speaking, San Francisco is one of the cities that is dealing more with this kind of rise in homelessness, though it’s always existed, but I think especially being exacerbated by the cost of housing in the Bay Area, thanks to the tech boom, the run-up cost of housing has impacted. I mean, folks that are not experiencing homelessness talk about this all the time when they’re thinking about what cities to move to.

I wanted to bring this up to you because I do think that we see the use of homeless people as a political wedge, not just in San Francisco but more broadly. One of the things that always strikes me as curious is that even kind of quote-unquote “well-meaning, liberal folk” will turn their backs on homeless people.

There’s a name for this. People colloquially call these folks NIMBYs, or Not In My Backyard folks, alluding to the idea that once this issue impacts people, these people, right? The people that are well-meaning liberal folks, in that affordable housing is going up in their neighborhood. They protest. They fight back.

Why do you think this issue turns even the “well-meaning liberal folks” away?

JENNIFER: It’s a really good question, and I think it kind of goes back to that intersectionality and the use of people as political scapegoats and kind of really kind of bringing up the fear. For unhoused people, it’s so traumatizing to be on the streets, and their worst moments are witnessed by everybody else.

You get in an argument with your partner, everybody’s there to listen in, all these private moments are public. I think creating this situation where basically we’re creating a permanent underclass in the United States. It is really disheartening because people do feel comfortable in these forums really saying very hateful things about an entire class of people that is completely unwarranted.

KENDALL: Yeah, I mean, I think we talk about this a lot on the podcast whether it’s in regards to anti-trans bans that are popping up across the country, education censorship efforts that are popping up in community meetings and school board meetings all across the country. Folks who feel fervently and are fueled by typically fear, which, then of after fear becomes hate show up. They show up in numbers and they show their emotion, and sometimes they’re the loudest voice in the room.

And I think oftentimes folks who don’t feel that way don’t show up because they don’t feel perhaps as passionate about it. What can you tell folks who are listening today, and they want to do something in their local communities? What can you tell them about a good first step?

JENNIFER: Yeah, the first things I think is homelessness is absolutely solvable, and we all got to feel that in our heart. I think this idea that it’s unsolvable is working against us, and that’s just not true. This is something we are creating a host of really bad decisions.

So folks should, first of all, get to know your unhoused neighbors, just as you, hopefully, are getting to know your housed neighbors in the same way.

Introduce yourself. There’s a lot of individual support people can give. Be aware of those common tropes. Be active in your local neighborhood groups and when they’re coming up and they want to solve homelessness and this whole idea of we need the city to come in and call the police, push back on that and organize against it.

Bring in some friends. Get a more positive direction, because that energy that’s pushing for a negative response can be shifted towards a positive response that actually solves it. And people need to be educated that a criminalization approach doesn’t work.

Get to know what services are in your area. And, of course, make sure you’re putting pressure on your local, state, and federal electeds. It needs to be a top priority for them, and it needs to be a top priority for our state reps.

And it needs to be a top priority for the people doing the local government. As we keep people homeless for longer and longer, it’s more and more expensive to solve it.

So, we need to do the work to make all these corrections, and once we do, and folks are stable, we really can see an end to homelessness in this country.

This interview is available at achi.org/podcast or wherever podcasts can be found.
STREET SHEET is currently recruiting vendors to sell the newspaper around San Francisco.

Vendors pick up the papers for free at our office in the Tenderloin and sell them for $2 apiece at locations across the City. You get to keep all the money you make from sales! Sign up to earn extra income while also helping elevate the voices of the homeless writers who make this paper so unique, and promoting the vision of a San Francisco where every human being has a home.

To sign up, visit our office at 280 Turk St from 10am-4pm on Monday-Thursday and 10am-Noon on Friday.

CELEBRATE 35 YEARS OF STREET SHEET

This year marks the 35th anniversary of Street Sheet, the longest continuously running street newspaper in the United States! In celebration, we are holding a year-long fundraising campaign with a goal of $90,000, enough cover the cost of printing Street Sheet for the next 3 years! Street Sheet has been an integral part of the Coalition on Homelessness's history, and a crucial platform for unhoused authors and artists to share their experiences. Please donate to celebrate its monumental legacy, and help us continue Street Sheet for years to come!
COME AND JOIN US AT OUR
MOTHER’S DAY ACTION

Thursday, May 9th at 12:00 PM
Steps of City Hall: 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place San Francisco CA 94102

No mother should roam we all deserve a home!

VEN ÚNETE A NOSOTROS EN NUESTRA
ACCION DEL DIA DE LAS MADRES

Jueves 9 de Mayo a las 12:00 PM
escaleras del Ayuntamiento: 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place San Francisco CA 94102

No madre debería andar rodando niños merecemos un hogar!
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Pride Issue
SUBMISSIONS OPEN
Send us your stories, photos, artworks, poems, comics focused on queer survival and resilience related to displacement and homelessness.
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