FILE NO. 200902

Petitions and Communications received from August 27, 2020, through September 9, 2020, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 15, 2020.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information will not be redacted.

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), making the following appointments: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Everett Hewlett Jr. Airport Commission term ending August 31, 2024
- Dr. Eurania Lopez Library Commission term ending January 15, 2022

From the Department of Public Health, issuing Directives of the Health Officer Nos. 2020-25, 2020-26 and 2020-27. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Public Health, issuing Orders of the Heath Officer Nos. C19-01c, C19-03b, C19-09b. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor, submitting the Whistleblower Program Annual Report and Quarter 4 Results, July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor, submitting the Quarterly Review of the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of March 31, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting the City and County of San Francisco's Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund monthly report, dated August 31, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor: (6)

From the Public Utilities Commission, pursuant to Resolution No. 227-18, submitting their quarterly report on the Status of Applications to PG&E for Electric Service. Copy: Each Supervisor: (7)

From the Recreation and Park Department, pursuant to Park Code, Section 3.21(f), submitting their annual Park Hour Report. Copy: Each Supervisor: (8)

From California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a Notice of Findings regarding the petition to list the Pacific leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. Copy: Each Supervisor: (9)

From California Fish and Game Commission, pursuant to Government Code,

Section 11346.1(a)(1), submitting notice of proposed emergency action with regards to the Purple Sea Urchin. Copy: Each Supervisor: (10)

From the California Office of Historic Preservation, pursuant to Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60.6(c), regarding the National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Mission Culture Center (Latinos in Twentieth Century California MPS. Copy: Each Supervisor: (11)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Departments - FYs 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 and the proposed Annual Salary Ordinance - FYs 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. File Nos. 200567 and 200568. 42 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Hearing for the Appeal of Revised Final Mitigated Negative Declaration - Proposed 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street Project. File No. 200800. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Hearing for the Appeal of Statutory Exemption From Environmental Review - MTA - Slow Streets, Phase 1. File No. 200883. 7 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From YIMBY Action, regarding the Hearing for the Appeal of Determination of Community Plan Evaluation - Proposed 1088 Howard Street Project. File No. 200891. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Nancy Wuerfel, regarding proposed Ordinance - Administrative Code - Department of Public Health - Providing Staff for the Behavioral Health Commission. File No. 200951. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From concerned citizens, regarding proposed Resolution - Urging the Association of Bay Area Governments in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process to Focus on Unmet Needs for Affordable Housing. File No. 200955. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Hearing for the Appeal of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review - Proposed 2001-37th Avenue Project; and Hearing - Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization - 2001-37th Avenue. File Nos. 200992 and 200996. 4 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD, regarding updated mapping radioactive elements - known radionuclides of concern. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Janey Youngblom, regarding amendments to the General Obligation Bond Pass Throughs. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From anonymous, regarding crime. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Jamey Frank, regarding public transportation and congestion pricing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From concerned citizens, regarding releasing restrictions on businesses and schools due to COVID-19. 11 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From concerned citizens, regarding homelessness in San Francisco. 6 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From BC, regarding weekly street cleaning in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Morley M. Singer M.D., regarding functions of the Vector Control and Healthy Housing Department. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association, regarding a proposal to replace Police Officers at the San Francisco International Airport with Deputy Sheriffs. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Peggy Fahnestock, regarding an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Terry, regarding a racist banner at the Bernal Heights library. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From National Lawyers Guild San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, regarding a request for reconsideration of approval and/or major mitigation of India Basin Mixed-Use Project and the Significant ongoing and harmful air pollution it would cause in Bayview Hunters Point. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From RJ Sloan, regarding various topics. 11 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Elizabeth Stahl, regarding San Francisco Police Department delaying the 272 reform recommendations issued by the US Department of Justice in 2016. Reform. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From concerned citizens, regarding a request for clarity around preschool guidance for their Fall operations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, regarding strongly urging Governor Newsom to veto Assembly Bill 725 (Wicks). Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding taxing vehicles used by on-demand delivery companies on the streets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From the Coalition for San Francisco, regarding their Treasure Island Building Moratorium Resolution. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Chaitanya Diwadkar, regarding the removal of the Wawona hens. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From John Smith, regarding tax dollars and the current condition of San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding restricting auto use during spare the air days. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From Eden Niemela, regarding a sheltered tenant falsely claiming disability. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>; <u>BOS-Legislative Aides</u>; <u>BOS-Administrative Aides</u>

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Peacock, Rebecca

(MYR); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)

Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment 3.100(18) - Airport Commission

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 5:10:00 PM

Attachments: <u>Clerk"s Memo 9.9.20.pdf</u>

2020-Everett Hewlett-SFO-Appt Letter.pdf Hewlett Jr Everett 7 2 2020.pdf 2020-Everett Hewlett-Resume.doc

Hello Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor has submitted the attached complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163 eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 9, 2020

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Reappointment - Airport Commission

On September 8, 2020, the Mayor submitted the following complete (re)appointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors.

o Everett Hewlett Jr. - term ending August 31, 2024

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the appointment as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you would like to hold a hearing on this reappointment, please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020.

c: Hillary Ronen - Rules Committee Chair

Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy

Victor Young - Rules Clerk

Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney

Sophia Kittler - Mayor's Legislative Liaison



LONDON N. BREED MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

September 8, 2020

San Francisco Board of Supervisors City Hall, Room 244 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointment:

Everett Hewlett to the Airport Commission for a four-year term ending August 31, 2024.

I am confident that Mr. Hewlett will continue to serve our community well. Attached are his qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how his appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696.

Sincerely,

London N. Breed

Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Administrative Aides

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); Peacock, Rebecca

(MYR); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)

Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment 3.100(18) - Library Commission

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 7:30:00 PM

Attachments: Clerk"s Memo 9.10.20.pdf

2020-Eurania Lopez-LIB-Appt Letter.pdf 2020-Eurania Lopez-F700.pdf 2020-Eurania Lopez-Resume.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Please see the attached memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163 eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 10, 2020

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Library Commission

On September 10, 2020, the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors.

o **Dr. Eurania Lopez -** term ending January 15, 2022

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by timely notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the appointment as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you would like to hold a hearing on this appointment, please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020.

c: Hillary Ronen - Rules Committee Chair

Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy

Victor Young - Rules Clerk

Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney

Sophia Kittler - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

Office of the Mayor SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

September 10, 2020

San Francisco Board of Supervisors City Hall, Room 244 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Dr. Eurania Lopez to the Library Commission for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 15, 2022, to the seat formerly held by Zoe Dunning.

I am confident that Dr. Lopez will serve our community well. Attached are her qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how her appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696.

Sincerely,

London N. Breed

Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-25

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR COOLING CENTERS

(PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: September 4, 2020

By this Directive, the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Health Officer") issues service-specific direction that facilities and other location in the community where people can cool down during designated hot weather events ("Cooling Centers") must follow as part of the local response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic. This Directive constitutes guidance as provided under Section 8.m of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h issued on September 1, 2020 (the "Stay-Safer-At-Home Order"), and, unless otherwise defined below, initially capitalized terms used in this Directive have the same meaning given them in that order. This Directive goes into effect immediately upon issuance, and remains in effect until suspended, superseded, or amended by the Health Officer. This Directive has support in the bases and justifications set forth in the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order and those listed below. As further provided below, this Directive automatically incorporates any revisions to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order or other future orders issued by the Health Officer that supersede that order or reference this Directive. This Directive is intended to promote best practices as to Social Distancing Requirements and sanitation measures, helping prevent the transmission of COVID-19 and safeguard the health of volunteers, Personnel, and members of the community who are involved with or utilize Cooling Centers.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Stay-Safer-at-Home Order prohibits indoor public or private gatherings of people from different households (as described in Section 3.f of the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order). But that order allows for the operation of Cooling Centers within the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") as Essential Governmental Functions (defined in Section 8.m of the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order) and as Healthcare Operations (defined in Section 8.g of the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order) as determined by the City through its departments. This Directive lists the mandatory requirements for the operation of any Cooling Center in the City under Sections 8.m and 11 of the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order, and no Cooling Center may operate except in compliance with this Directive and the attached guidelines. All people seeking respite from the heat inside a Cooling Center ("Visitors") are also required to comply with this Directive.
- 2. A Cooling Center may operate in the City during a Heat Event so long as it complies with all of the following requirements:
 - a. <u>Declared Heat Events Only</u>. The Cooling Center is only allowed to operate during a declared Heat Event, as defined in Section 3.b below.
 - b. General Cooling Requirements. The Cooling Center is only allowed to operate when offering Visitors a location that has features that allow it to provide a respite from hot temperatures elsewhere in the City. Subject to the limitations and requirements of this Directive, such features can include: central air



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25

conditioning; window or portable air conditioning units; evaporative coolers; fans or other forms of air circulation; the provision of cold non-alcoholic beverages and/or ice; the provision of clean wet towels; and spaces that due to the building's design remain cooler than outside temperatures.

- c. Screening. A Cooling Center must screen all Personnel, volunteers, and Visitors on a daily basis using the standard screening questions attached to this Directive as Appendix A (the "Screening Handout"). A copy of the Screening Handout should be provided to anyone on request, although a poster or other large-format version of the Screening Handout may be used to review the questions with people verbally. Any person who answers "yes" to any screening question is at risk of having the SARS-CoV-2 virus, must be prohibited from entering the Cooling Center, and should be referred for appropriate support as outlined on the Screening Handout. Screening must occur before people enter the facility or location in order to prevent the inadvertent spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Cooling Centers can use the guidance available online at https://www.sfcdcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/COVID19-Screening-Questions-UPDATE-05.26.2020.pdf for determining how best to conduct screening.
- d. <u>Daily Log</u>. The Cooling Center must maintain a daily written log of all Personnel, volunteers, and Visitors in order to assist with case investigation and contact tracing if needed. The log should include contact information such as a name, telephone number, email address, and/or street address. For Visitors, participation in the daily log is voluntary.
- e. <u>Face Coverings Required</u>. A face covering is required of Personnel, volunteers, and Visitors who are age 2 or older while at the Cooling Center or in line outside consistent with the Health Officer Order No. C19-12c (the "Face Covering Order") and any future revisions to that order.
 - i. As required by the Face Covering Order, Personnel, volunteers, and Visitors who have a medical exemption to wearing a Face Covering must wear a Face Covering alternative such as a face shield.
 - ii. As outlined in the Face Covering Order, Cooling Centers should not exclude groups with children between the ages of 2-10 who refuse or are unable to wear a Face Covering, although wearing a Face Covering should be encouraged for those children.
- f. <u>Physical Distancing</u>. Visitors who do not live in the same household must remain six feet apart, regardless of whether wearing a Face Covering.
- g. Cleaning Standards. Cooling Centers must abide by minimum cleaning standards issued by DPH and available online at https://www.sfcdcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/COVID19-Disinfectants-Safety-FINAL-04.18.2020.pdf. In addition, window-mount and other portable air conditioning units must be cleaned and undergo basic maintenance prior to being placed into service for use in a Cooling Center (including performing a cleaning if the air conditioning unit was already in service in the facility prior to use as a Cooling Center this year). And evaporative (swamp) coolers must



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25

be cleaned prior to being placed into service in a Cooling Center this year and maintained in strict accordance with the manufacturer's instructions including periodic replacement of the cooling pads.

- h. Room Capacity Limits. Room occupancy in any location where Visitors are present must not exceed the lower of (1) those set by building code or (2) the number of people able to fit in the room with required physical distancing (approximately 113 square feet per person) as set forth by the United States Fire Administration online at https://www.usfa.fema.gov/coronavirus/planning-response/occupancy-social-distancing.html.
- i. <u>Fresh Air Ventilation Standards</u>. The Cooling Center must meet or exceed applicable building code requirements for fresh-air ventilation of each space where Visitors are present via use of <u>operable</u> windows and/or mechanical ventilation.
 - i. Note 1 Window security screens, gratings, or window stops installed after building plans were approved may reduce the amount of fresh air below code requirements. If these features impede air flow then they must be removed for the duration of Cooling Center operation.
 - ii. Note 2 Mechanical ventilation systems must not be modified by reducing fresh air intake volumes and increasing recirculation to increase cooling capacity. All reasonable attempts should be made to maximize the amount of fresh air provided by the mechanical systems.
 - iii. Note 3 Window-mounted air conditioners must be set to provide maximum (100%) fresh (outdoor) air if that setting is available. Such units must not be set to recirculate some or all of the room air.
- j. <u>Portable Fan Use</u>. At indoor temperatures under 90 degrees, portable fans (such as box or pedestal fans) may be used but should be positioned to minimize air being blown between Visitors from different households. At indoor temperatures of 90 degrees or over, portable fans must not be used.
- k. Other Restricted Activities. Certain activities are higher-risk indoors and are not permitted at Cooling Centers. These include all of the following: singing; playing of wind or brass instruments; shouting or yelling; and use of shared activity equipment or items (such as board games, pool tables, etc.) unless the equipment or items are disinfected between each use with a cleaner that is designated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as meeting criteria for use against SARS-CoV-2. A list of such cleaning productions can be found online at https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/list-n-disinfectants-use-against-sars-cov-2-covid-19. Such cleaning products must be used in strict accordance with the product label and manufacturer's instructions, including but not limited to the manufacturer's specified dwell (wet contact time) for SARS-CoV-2, which can be obtained from the product manufacturer or found on the EPA list linked above.



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25

3. Definitions:

a. As used in this Directive, the term "Cooling Center" refers to any facility or location that is set up in relation to a Heat Event to help people in the City stay cool and that welcomes Visitors for that purpose during the Heat Event. The term includes any facility or location organized by any governmental entity, non-governmental organization ("NGO"), faith-based organization ("FBO"), or business, and also any joint collaboration between any such entities or groups.

This Directive does not allow any business, organization, or entity that is separately prohibited by an order or directive of the Health Officer or by any guideline issued by the Governor or the State of California from operating in violation of that other order, directive, or guideline. By way of example and without limitation, this means that none of the following are allowed as Cooling Centers at the time of this Directive's issuance: bars or restaurants serving food or drinks indoors; gyms or fitness centers allowing indoor fitness offerings; shopping malls operating indoor retail unless separately allowed by the Health Officer to do so; and movie or live theatres screening films or presenting productions indoors.

In addition, Cooling Centers are not allowed to charge a fee for admission, although they may collect optional donations.

- b. As used in this Directive, the term "Heat Event" refers to the time period in relation to which the City and the City's Department of Emergency Management ("DEM") declare an Extreme Heat Advisory or Extreme Heat Warning. Often Heat Events are forecast in advance, and the term "Heat Event" covers the actual period of the hot weather as designated by the City and DEM.
- c. As used in this Directive, the term "Personnel" includes all of the following people who provide goods or services associated with the Cooling Center in San Francisco: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the business); vendors who are permitted to sell or offer goods onsite; volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Cooling Center. "Personnel" includes "gig workers" who perform work via the business or entity's app or other online interface, if any.
- 4. Each Cooling Center, before it begins to allow Visitors onsite, must create, adopt, implement, and post a written health and safety plan checklist (a "Health and Safety Plan"). The Health and Safety Plan must be substantially in the form attached to this Directive as Appendix B. In addition, each Cooling Center must have a Social Distancing Protocol checklist posted as required by Appendix A of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order (Order No. C19-07h or any future version of that order), a copy of which can be found online at www.sfdph.org/healthorders. The Cooling Center must follow those requirements and update them as necessary for the duration of this Directive, including, without limitation, as this Directive is amended or extended in writing by the Health Officer and consistent with any extension of the



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25

Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, any other order that supersedes that order, and any Health Officer order that references this Directive.

- 5. Each Cooling Center must (a) make the Health and Safety Plan available to Visitors or Personnel on request, (b) provide a summary of the Health and Safety Plan to all Personnel working on site or otherwise in the City in relation to its operations, and (c) post the Health and Safety Plan at each entrance to any Cooling Center site within the City. Also, each Cooling Center must provide a copy of the Health and Safety Plan and evidence of its implementation to any authority enforcing this Directive upon demand.
- 6. If an aspect, service, or operation of the Cooling Center is also covered by another Health Officer order or directive (all of which are available at www.sfdph.org/healthorders and www.sfdph.org/healthorders and www.sfdph.org/directives), then the Cooling Center must comply with all applicable orders and directives, and it must complete all relevant Health and Safety Plan forms.
- 7. Each Cooling Center subject to this Directive must provide items such as Face Coverings (as detailed in the Face Covering Order), hand sanitizer or handwashing stations, or both, and disinfectant and related supplies to any of the Cooling Center's on-site Personnel, volunteers, and Visitors. If any Cooling Center is unable to provide these required items to on-site Personnel, volunteers, or Visitors or otherwise fails to comply with required Guidance, then it must cease operating until it can fully comply and demonstrate its strict compliance. Further, as to any non-compliant operation, any such Cooling Center is subject to immediate closure and the fines and other legal remedies described below, as a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order.
- 8. This Directive may be revised by the Health Officer, through revision of this Directive or another future directive or order, as conditions relating to COVID-19 require, in the discretion of the Health Officer. All Cooling Centers must stay updated regarding any changes to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order and this Directive by checking the Department of Public Health website (www.sfdph.org/healthorders; www.sfdph.org/directives) regularly.

This Directive is issued in furtherance of the purposes of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. Where a conflict exists between this Directive and any state, local, or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including, without limitation, the Social Distancing Protocol, the most restrictive provision controls. Failure to carry out this Directive is a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

Date: September 4, 2020

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH, Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco

City and County of San Francisco Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25 – Appendix A Screening Handout for Weather Relief Centers (September 4, 2020)

Each Weather Relief Center must screen staff, volunteers, and Visitors prior to entry. Go to www.sfcdcp.org/covid19 for more info or a copy of this form.

<u>Part 1</u> – You must answer the following questions <u>every day</u> before entering this Weather Relief Center.

- 1. Within the last 10 days have you been diagnosed with COVID-19 or had a test confirming you have the virus?
- 2. Do you live in the same household with, or have you had close contact (see reverse side of this sheet) with someone who in the past 14 days was diagnosed with COVID-19 or had a test confirming they have the virus?

If the answer to either question is "yes", do <u>not</u> enter the Weather Relief Center and follow the steps listed in <u>Part 2</u> below.

3. Have you had one or more of these symptoms today (based on your age group) or within the past 24 hours, which is new or not explained by a pre-existing condition?

For ALL ages:

• Fever or temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C)

Sore throat

Diarrhea

For ADULTS 18 years old or older:

Cough

Shortness of breath

Chills

- Headache
- Body Aches
- Fatigue

- Loss of taste or smell
- Runny nose
- Nasal congestion

For YOUTH under 18 years old:

 New uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline)

- Vomiting
- Abdominal pain
- New onset of severe headache, especially with a fever

If the answer to Question 3 is "yes", do not enter the Weather Relief Center and follow the steps listed in Part 3 below.

Part 2 -

• If you answered **yes to Question 1:** you are subject to the Health Officer Isolation Directive.

Follow Isolation Steps at: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-quidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf

• If you answered **yes to Question 2:** you are subject to the Health Officer <u>Quarantine</u> Directive.

Follow Quarantine Steps at: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf

Do not socialize with others until the Isolation or Quarantine Steps tell you it is safe to return!

Part 3 – If you answered yes to Question 3:

You may have COVID-19 and must be tested for the virus in order to know if you have the virus. Follow these steps:

- 1. Contact your usual healthcare provider about getting tested for the virus, or sign up for free testing at CityTestSF https://sf.gov/get-tested-covid-19-citytestsf.
- 2. Wait for your test results at home while minimizing exposure to those you live with. A good resource is https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html
- 3. If your result is positive (confirms that you have the virus) go to *Part 2* above and follow **Isolation Steps.**
- 4. If your result is negative, do not socialize with others until you have had at least **24 hours** without fever or other symptoms.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR MORE INFORMATION
If you have questions about any part of this Handout, please call 3-1-1

City and County of San Francisco Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25 – Appendix A Screening Handout for Weather Relief Centers (September 4, 2020)

Questions

What do I do if I answered "yes" to a question on the reverse side but am worried about staying home, where it's too hot, too cold, or there are other concerns?

It is important that you take whatever steps you can to stay safe and healthy right now. You cannot enter the Weather Relief Center because you will put others at risk of getting the virus that causes COVID-19.

If you are feeling sick, you should talk to your healthcare provider. If you are feeling very ill, you may want to contact an urgent care center. If this is an emergency, you should call 9-1-1 or seek care from a hospital.

How do I know if I am a Close Contact for Question 2 on the reverse side of this handout?

In order to determine if you are a "close contact", answer the following questions:

- Have you been around another person who in the last 14 days either has or had a COVID-19 diagnosis or has or had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection? (A "COVID-19 Positive Person")
- 2) Were you around the COVID-19 Positive Person during the period any time between 48 hours before they had symptoms or had a confirmed infection and the time after their symptoms or infection resolved?
- 3) During that same period, did the COVID-19 Positive Person do any of the following:
 - a) Live or stay overnight with you;
 - b) Was your sexual partner;
 - c) Took care of you or allowed you to take care of them;
 - d) Stayed within 6 feet of you for more than 15 minutes (regardless of whether they were or were not wearing a face covering); or
 - e) Exposed you to direct contact with their body fluids or secretions (such as coughing or sneezing on you) while you were not wearing a face mask, gown, and gloves?

If you answered yes to all of 1), 2), and 3), then you are a "close contact".

The meaning of Close Contact is explained in more detail in the Isolation and Quarantine Guidance, which is available online at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25 (Appendix B) Health and Safety Plan (issued 9/4/2020)

Each Cooling Center must complete, post onsite, and follow this Health and Safety Plan.

Check off all items below to show compliance and list other required information.

	•	•
Busin	ess/Entity name:	Contact name:
Facility Address:		Email / telephone:
(You	may contact the person listed above wit	th any questions or comments about this plan.)
	The Cooling Center is familiar with and Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25, a	d complies with all requirements set forth in available at www.sfdph.org/directives .
	The Cooling Center is only allowed to City's Department of Emergency Mana	operate during a Heat Event declared by the agement.
	The Cooling Center must screen all Pe on a daily basis using the Screening F who answers "yes" to any of the scree	ersonnel, volunteers, and Visitors before entry andout (Appendix A to the Directive). Anyone ning questions must not be allowed in.
		aily written log with contact information of all isitor participation in the daily log is voluntary.
		sonnel, volunteers, and Visitors at the Cooling er's Face Covering Order (Order No. C19-12c).
	The Cooling Center will require that Vi remain six feet apart while onsite.	sitors who do not live in the same household wil
	The Cooling Center will follow the clear Directive.	ning requirements listed in Section 2.g of the
	Room occupancy will be limited by the building code or the number of people distancing (of approx. 113 square feet	Cooling Center to the lower of those set by able to fit in the room with required physical per person).
	The Cooling Center will meet or exceed fresh-air ventilation for locations where maximized and window-mounted units	d applicable building code requirements for Visitors are present. Fresh air intake must be should provide maximum outdoor air.
	If portable fans are used, they must be Visitors from different households and 90 degrees.	e positioned to minimize air being blow between must not be used at indoor temperatures above
	activity equipment or items (such as be	uments, shouting or yelling, and use of shared pard games, pool tables, etc.) are prohibited, ms may occur if they are disinfected between er for use against SARS-CoV-2.



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-25 (Appendix B) Health and Safety Plan (issued 9/4/2020)

The Cooling Center will complete, post, and comply with a Social Distancing Protocol checklist as required by Appendix A of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h or any future version of that order, a copy of which can be found online at www.sfdph.org/healthorders .
The Cooling Center will make this Health and Safety Plan available to Visitors or Personnel on request, provide a summary of it to all Personnel working on site or otherwise in the City in relation to its operations, and (c) post it at each entrance.

Additional Measures

Explain:

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Administrative Aides

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)

Subject: FW: Two new directives - Specialized targeted support services directive (2020-26) and Outdoor gym directive

(2020-27

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:03:00 AM
Attachments: 2020.09.08 Directive 2020-27 Outdoor Gyms FINAL.pdf

2020.09.04 FINAL Directive 2020-26 Specialized Support Directive.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached Directives of the Health Officer Nos. 2020-27 and 2020-26.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163 eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Patil, Sneha (DPH) < sneha.patil@sfdph.org> Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 8:34 AM

To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

<eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>

Cc: Katy Tang (AIR) <katy.tang@flysfo.com>

Subject: Two new directives - Specialized targeted support services directive (2020-26) and Outdoor

gym directive (2020-27

Hi Angela and Eileen - please see two new directives issued by the Health Officer attached. City attorney suummary below.

Specialized Targeted Support Services Directive

This is a new health directive regarding best practices for specialized targeted support services that TK-12 schools may provide for vulnerable children and youth. The September 1 revision to the Stay-Safe-at-Home Order allows schools to offer these services in-person beginning September 8. This directive allows TK-12

schools to provide specialized targeted support services in-person to vulnerable children and youth, in stable cohorts of up to 14. Specialized targeted support services include:

- Occupational and physical therapy services;
- Speech and language services;
- Behavioral services, including ABA therapy or individual counseling if part of an individualized educational program (IEP) or individual family support plan (IFSP); and
- Educational support services and assessments as part of a targeted intervention strategy such as, but not limited to, those related to English learner status, IEPs, and other student support plans.

The directive sets forth required safety precautions, and also requires parents or guardians to sign an acknowledgement of health risk before their children or youth may participate in the program.

Outdoor Gyms Directive

This directive allows gyms to operate outdoors. Here's a summary of the best practices required by the directive:

- All fitness activities must take place entirely outdoors. Customers may enter a building only to use the restroom or if otherwise permitted under a separate health order or directive.
- 2. Gym equipment and space must be arranged to facilitate compliance with sixfoot minimum distancing.
 - a. Gym setup must accommodate pedestrians and passersby and comply with other safety and ADA obligations for people with disabilities.
- 3. Gym capacity is determined by the number of people who can use a space while maintaining required distancing at all times. There is not fixed numerical limit on number of people who can use the space.
 - a. But under the Order group outdoor fitness classes are still limited to 12 people including the instructor.
- 4. Customers must be screened for symptoms before they may enter the gym space.
- 5. Attached to the directive is a model screening guide.
- 6. Customers and Personnel must maintain at least six-feet physical distance between and among those not in their household at all times.
- 7. Customers and Personnel must wear a face covering at all times, including while exercising.
- 8. Enhanced personal sanitation included a requirement that Customers and

- Personnel are required to sanitize or wash hands before entering gym space. Gyms are required to provide hand sanitizer throughout gym space.
- 9. Enhanced equipment sanitation includes a requirement that Customers disinfect equipment before and after each use. Personnel are required to clean equipment and other high touch surfaces throughout the day

Sneha Patil, MPH

Director, Office of Policy and Planning

San Francisco Department of Public Health

sneha.patil@sfdph.org 1 415-554-2795



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-27

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR OUTDOOR GYMS OR OUTDOOR FITNESS CENTERS

(PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: September 8, 2020

By this Directive, the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Health Officer") issues industry-specific direction that businesses offering outdoor gyms and fitness centers as described below, must follow as part of the local response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic. This Directive constitutes industryspecific guidance as provided under Section 4 of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h issued on September 1, 2020 (the "Stay-Safer-At-Home Order") and, unless otherwise defined below, initially capitalized terms used in this Directive have the same meaning given them in that order. This Directive goes into effect on September 9, 2020 at 9:00 a.m., and remains in effect until suspended, superseded, or amended by the Health Officer. This Directive has support in the bases and justifications set forth in the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. As further provided below, this Directive automatically incorporates any revisions to the Stav-Safer-At-Home Order or other future orders issued by the Health Officer that supersede that order or reference this Directive. This Directive is intended to promote best practices as to Social Distancing Requirements and sanitation measures, helping prevent the transmission of COVID-19 and safeguard the health of workers, customers, and the community.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. This Directive applies to all owners, operators, managers, and supervisors of any business operating outdoor gyms or outdoor fitness centers, as set forth in Section 16 of Appendix C-1 the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order ("Outdoor Gyms").
- 2. Attached as <u>Exhibit A</u> to this Directive is a list of best practices that apply to Outdoor Gyms (the "Best Practices"). Each Outdoor Gym must comply with all of the relevant requirements listed in the Best Practices.
- 3. Each Outdoor Gym, before it begins to offer outdoor gym space, services, or equipment, or allow Personnel onsite on or after 9 a.m. on September 9, 2020, must create, adopt, and implement a written health and safety plan (a "Health and Safety Plan"). The Health and Safety Plan must be substantially in the form attached to this Directive as Exhibit B.
- 4. Guidance from the Department of Public Health related to Outdoor Gyms is attached to this Directive as <u>Exhibit C</u>, each Outdoor Gym must follow that guidance. The guidance is available at http://www.sfdph.org/directives.
- 5. If an aspect, service, or operation of the Outdoor Gym is also covered by another Health Officer directive (all of which are available at http://www.sfdph.org/directives), then the Outdoor Gym must comply with all applicable directives, and it must complete all relevant Health and Safety Plan forms.



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27

- 6. Each Outdoor Gym must (a) make the Health and Safety Plan available to a customer and Personnel on request, (b) provide a summary of the Health and Safety Plan to all Personnel working on site or otherwise in the City in relation to its operations, and (c) post the Health and Safety Plan at each entrance to any physical business site within the City. Also, each Outdoor Gym must provide a copy of the Health and Safety Plan and evidence of its implementation to any authority enforcing this Directive upon demand.
- 7. Each Outdoor Gym subject to this Directive must provide items such as Face Coverings (as provided in Health Order No. C19-12c issued on July 22, 2020, and any future amendment to that order), hand sanitizer or handwashing stations, or both, and disinfectant and related cleaning supplies to Personnel, all as required by the Best Practices. If any such Outdoor Gym is unable to provide these required items or otherwise fails to comply with required Best Practices or fails to abide by its Health and Safety Plan, then it must cease operating until it can fully comply and demonstrate its strict compliance. Further, as to any non-compliant Outdoor Gym, any such Outdoor Gym is subject to immediate closure and the fines and other legal remedies described below, as a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order.
- 8. Each Outdoor Gym must screen all Personnel daily and each customer on the day of gym use using the standard screening questions attached to this Directive as Exhibit D (the "Screening Handout"). A copy of the Screening Handout should be provided to anyone on request, although a poster or other large-format version of the Screening Handout may be used to review the questions with people verbally. Any person who answers "yes" to any screening question is at risk of having the SARS-CoV-2 virus, must be prohibited from entering the outdoor Gym, and should be referred for appropriate support as outlined on the Screening Handout. Screening must occur before people enter the facility or location in order to prevent the inadvertent spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus.
- 9. For purposes of this Directive, "Personnel" includes all of the following people who provide goods or services associated with an Outdoor Gym: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the business); independent contractors; vendors who are permitted to sell goods onsite; volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Outdoor Gym. "Personnel" includes "gig workers" who perform work via the business's app or other online interface, if any.
- 10. This Directive and the attached Best Practices may be revised by the Health Officer, through revision of this Directive or another future directive or order, as conditions relating to COVID-19 require, in the discretion of the Health Officer. Each Outdoor Gym must stay updated regarding any changes to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order and this Directive by checking the Department of Public Health website (https://www.sfdph.org/directives) regularly.
- 11. Implementation of this Directive augments—but does not limit—the obligations of each Outdoor Gym under the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order including, but not limited to, the obligation to prepare, post, and implement a Social Distancing Protocol under Section 4.d and Appendix A of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. The Outdoor Gym must follow these industry-specific Best Practices and update them as



Date: September 8, 2020

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27

necessary for the duration of this Directive, including, without limitation, as this Directive is amended or extended in writing by the Health Officer and consistent with any extension of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, any other order that supersedes that order, and any Health Officer order that references this Directive.

This Directive is issued in furtherance of the purposes of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. Where a conflict exists between this Directive and any state, local, or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including, without limitation, the Social Distancing Protocol, the most restrictive provision controls. Failure to carry out this Directive is a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,

omas Magion

Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco



Exhibit A to Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27 (issued 9/8/2020)

Best Practices for Businesses Offering Outdoor Gym Services

In addition to preparing, posting, and implementing the Social Distancing Protocol required by Section 4.d and Appendix A of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h (the "Social Distancing Protocol"), each Outdoor Gym that operates in the City must comply with each requirement listed below and prepare a Health and Safety Plan substantially in the format of Exhibit B, below.

1. Section 1 – General Requirements for Outdoor Gyms:

- 1.1. All gym or fitness services, equipment, and space must be provided entirely outdoors including, but not limited to, therapy or other services unless such services are permitted under the Ambulatory Care Directive (Directive No. 20-20b, Issued September 1, 2020) in which case all requirements of that directive must be met. All indoor spaces such as locker rooms, shower facilities, changing areas, lounges, and lobbies must remain closed to customers and the general public, except as expressly provided in this Section 1.1 below.
 - 1.1.1. Customers must remain outdoors at all times except they may enter an establishment to use the restroom or reach an outdoor space that is only accessible by traveling through the establishment. Outdoor gyms should encourage customers to use the restroom before coming to the gym. Customers must not use the restroom solely to wash their hands and must sanitize their hands before and after touching common use surfaces in bathrooms such as door handles.
 - 1.1.2. Customers may enter an establishment if otherwise permitted under the State Health Order, Health Officer Order No. C19-07h (the "Stay-Safer-at-Home Order"), and any applicable industry-specific directives or guidance. For example, customers may enter a space that currently qualifies as an In-store Retail business that operates in compliance with all applicable Health Officer Orders and Directive No. 2020-17. Copies of industry-specific directives are available online at https://www.sfdph.org/directives.
 - 1.1.3. Outdoor gyms must consider the risks associated with local streets, sidewalks, traffic, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Outdoor Gyms must take all reasonable and feasible efforts to reduce customer and Personnel exposure to traffic and bike lanes, minimize blocking visibility of other travelers (whether vehicle, pedestrian, or bicyclist), and minimize or eliminate potential blockages of passageways, including ADA-compliant public access to sidewalks for persons with disabilities. Outdoor Gyms must comply with state and local laws, regulations, and permitting requirements (e.g., ADA access and compliance with applicable zoning), including, but not limited to, the placement of outdoor structures and service stations. Outdoor Gyms must take all reasonable and feasible steps to protect passersby from exposure to exhalations of customers using the Outdoor Gym and must arrange the Outdoor Gym space to allow pedestrians (including, but not limited to, those using wheelchairs or other assistive devices) sufficient adjacent sidewalk space so that they may pass by the Outdoor Gym while maintaining at least six feet of physical space from customers. For example, Outdoor Gyms may post signage or use tape to directing passers by to move along the building line to maximize gym space while



maintaining social distance.

- 1.1.4. Outdoor Gyms must address the potential hazards that result from moving outside, including: (1) ensuring use of electrical devices and extension cords in compliance with Cal/OSHA's Guide to Electrical Safety; and (2) ensuring there are no tripping hazards from cords or other equipment.
- 1.1.5. Outdoor Gyms must comply with the Cal/OSHA standards for heat and air quality illness prevention for outdoor Personnel, including an effective heat illness prevention plan with written procedures. Outdoor Gyms are permitted to use sun or weather shelters in accordance with Section 1.8 of this Directive and any applicable SFDPH guidance.
- 1.2. Customers and Personnel must maintain physical distancing of at least six feet from people outside of their Household at all times. Customers must be reminded of their obligation to maintain at least six feet of distance from Personnel, particularly when Personnel are carrying out sanitation or other work-related duties.
- 1.3. Outdoor Gym capacity is determined by the number of people who may safely fit in the Outdoor Gym space at any time while at all times adhering to Social Distancing requirements under this Directive and the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order.
 - 1.3.1. Evaluate the facility to determine the number of people (including customers and Personnel) who may safely fit in the Outdoor Gym area at any time while at all times adhering to Social Distancing Requirements under this Directive and the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. For assistance in understanding the impact of occupancy on social distancing, see:
 https://www.usfa.fema.gov/coronavirus/planning_response/occupancy_social_distancing.html. Educate Personnel about capacity limits and require them to enforce limits by, for example, spacing out customer reservations.
 - 1.3.2. Arrange Outdoor Gym equipment and space to facilitate physical distancing of at least six feet between and among Customers and Personnel. Alter or enhance the physical space to encourage appropriately-distanced movement into, out of, and within the Outdoor Gym. For example, use signage, floor tape, or other indicators to assist Personnel and customers in maintaining Social Distance and moving safely around the Outdoor Gym space.
 - 1.3.3. Create a system for managing capacity, enforcing Social Distancing and Face Covering requirements, and conducting Customer symptom screening. To more effectively fulfill these requirements, it is strongly recommended that Outdoor Gyms create a reservation system for gym access or particular high-use equipment.
 - 1.3.4. If an Outdoor Gym cannot ensure maintenance of at least six-foot distance within the facility between and among customers and Personnel, such as by moving workout stations or spreading Personnel out, then it must reduce the number of people permitted in the facility at any given time accordingly.
 - 1.3.5. Outdoor Gyms are strongly encouraged to set aside spaces or times for use by community members who are particularly vulnerable to poor health outcomes from COVID-19.



- 1.4. Customers and Personnel must be screened in accordance with Section 8 of this Directive before entering the Outdoor Gym. Customers who have tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19 in the past 14 days, have come into close contact with a person who tested positive for the virus in the past 14 days, or have any of the symptoms listed in this Section 1.4 within 24 hours of being screened must not enter the Outdoor Gym. The symptom screening questions are:
 - **1.4.1.** Has the person had any one or more of the following symptoms which is new or not explained by a pre-existing condition that day or within the preceding 24 hours? The symptoms include:

For <u>adults</u> (individuals 18 years or older): temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); cough; sore throat; shortness of breath; chills; headache; body aches; fatigue; loss of smell or taste; diarrhea; runny nose; nasal congestion; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19.

For <u>children</u> (those younger than 18 years): temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); sore throat; new uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline); diarrhea, vomiting, or abdominal pain; new onset of severe headache, especially with a fever; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19.

If any listed symptom is present, the person might be positive for SARS-CoV-2 and should be referred for testing.

- 1.5. Customers must wear a Face Covering or alternative face covering as described in Health Officer Order No. C19-12c (the "Face Covering Order") at all times they are present at an Outdoor Gym, including while exercising. Personnel must wear a Face Covering or alternative face covering at all times as required by the Face Covering Order. If any customer refuses to comply with the Face Covering Order or other provision of this Directive, then the Outdoor Gym must refuse service to the individual and request that the individual leave the facility.
- 1.6. Customers may only engage in self-directed fitness in the Outdoor Gym space unless otherwise permitted by the Stay-Safer-At-Home-Order. For example, customers may individually use treadmills, free weights, or other fitness equipment and may engage in outdoor fitness classes in accordance with this Directive and Section B.(1) of Appendix C1 to the Stay-Safe-At-Home Order.
- 1.7. Outdoor Gyms must develop a plan and implement sanitation requirements that exceed standard industry requirements. Outdoor gyms must implement all applicable sanitation requirements of the Social Distancing Protocol.
 - 1.7.1. Equip the entrance with a hand washing station or hand sanitizer or sanitizing wipes. Require all customers and Personnel to wash hands for 20 seconds in soap and warm water or use hand sanitizer before entering the Outdoor Gym space. Place hand sanitizer or sanitizing wipe dispensers in the Outdoor Gym space for use by customers and Personnel particularly near any common touch equipment. If wipes are used, ensure that lined, non-touch trash receptacles are available nearby.



- 1.7.2. Require all customers to disinfect any fitness machine, accessories, or other equipment they used both before and after each use by people from different Households. Make disinfectant spray and wipes available to customers at convenient locations around the Outdoor Gym space. Post signage reminding customers of their obligation under this paragraph.
- 1.7.3. Wherever possible, install touchless, automatic water dispensers for use with personal, reusable water bottles or single-use, disposable paper cups. Display signage reminding Personnel and customers that the bottle or cups should not touch the water dispenser. If a touchless water dispenser is not feasible, encourage customers to bring their own water and remind Personnel and customers to wash their hands or use proper hand sanitizer before and after touching the water release button on drinking fountains. Amenities or other items not directly related to self-directed fitness activities are not permitted in the Outdoor Gym space.
- 1.7.4. Place signage around the Outdoor Gym emphasizing basic infection prevention measures, including the requirements to wear a Face Covering and maintain proper social distance at all times, stay home when feeling sick, and wash or sanitize hands frequently.
- 1.7.5. Disinfecting products must be approved for use against COVID-19 on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved list available at: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/list-n-disinfectants-use-against-sars-cov-2-covid-19). Outdoor Gyms must follow all product and safety instructions.
- 1.7.6. Require Personnel to regularly clean and disinfect high touch areas and surfaces, fitness machines, gear, accessories, sanitation stations, or other equipment throughout the day following CDC guidelines available at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/cleaning-disinfection.html. Provide Personnel adequate time and space to complete all sanitation duties.
- 1.8. Consistent with the limitations of the State Health Order, the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order, and guidance from SFDPH, Outdoor Gyms may, subject to any applicable permit requirements, conduct their operations under a tent, canopy, or other sun or weather shelter, but only as long as no more than one side is closed, allowing sufficient outdoor air movement. Also, the number and composition of barriers used for outdoor services must allow the free flow of air in the breathing zone.
- 1.9. If all or part of an Outdoor Gym's establishment has been vacant or dormant during the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, then the Outdoor Gym must ensure plumbing is functioning and that pipes are flushed before use. The San Francisco PUC provides guidance for flushing and preparing water systems at: https://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=1327. Outdoor Gyms must conspicuously post a copy of this Directive and all attachments, the Health and Safety Plan, and the Social Distancing Protocol (1) on any public facing website and (2) at the physical Outdoor Gym site.



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27 (Exhibit B) Health and Safety Plan (issued 9/8/2020)

Each Outdoor Gym must complete, post onsite and online, and follow this Health and Safety Plan.

Check off all items below that apply and list other required information. Business/Entity name: Contact name: Facility Address: Email / telephone: (You may contact the person listed above with any questions or comments about this plan.) ☐ Reviewed and completed all requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/directives. ☐ Completed any necessary adjustments to the layout of the business to allow for proper social distancing ☐ Obtained any necessary permits needed for outdoor shelters. ☐ Completed evaluation of electrical safety and implemented all required precautions. ☐ Plumbing is functioning and, if the facility was dormant, then the pipes are flushed. ☐ Developed a plan to ensure Personnel and customers comply with social distancing requirements and to limit the number of people at the outdoor business at a given time, consistent with the requirements in the Stay-Safer-at-Home Order. ☐ Require customers to wear a Face Covering or alternative Face Covering at all times. Personnel are required to wear Face Coverings as provided in the Face Covering Order. ☐ Ensure daily COVID-19 symptom self-verifications are completed for all Personnel as required by the Social Distancing Protocol. Ensure that all Customers complete verbal COVID-19 screening before entering the Outdoor Gym space. Anyone who answers "yes" to a screening question must be prevented from entry. \square Provided hand washing stations or hand sanitizer at entrance to Outdoor Gym and at convenient locations throughout Outdoor Gym Space. ☐ Implemented all sanitization requirements as described in Directive 2020-27, including requirement that Customers clean equipment before and after use. ☐ Personnel and customers have access to cleaning supplies so that they can clean surfaces as required. ☐ High touch surfaces in common areas are cleaned and disinfected routinely throughout the day. Posted signage reminding customers of their obligations to disinfect equipment before and after use, maintain social distance, wear a Face Covering, and wash or sanitize hands frequently. ☐ Reviewed and implemented all industry-specific guidance in the Directive.



Tip Sheet and Frequently Asked Questions for Businesses Offering Outdoor Gym Services

09/08/2020

The following Tip Sheet and FAQ was developed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health for use by local facilities and will be posted at http://www.sfcdcp.org. Information may change.

AUDIENCE: Businesses offering outdoor gym services during COVID-19 pandemic.

BACKGROUND: On September, 09, 2020 the Health Officer issued directive No. 2020-27 (found at the www.sfdph.org/directives) authorizing and providing guidance for businesses offering Outdoor Gym services.

PURPOSE: This document addresses major points in, but does not replace, the Directive.

Tips for opening Outdoor GYMS

This Tip sheet is a summary. It is highly advised for Business Owners to read the Public Health Directive.

Gyms can open outdoors. Now what? Here are tips for opening a gym space outdoors while complying with the Health Officer issued Directive No. 2020-27.

Prepare, post and implement the following:

- Health and Safety Plan (see Exhibit B of Directive No. 2020-27, posted at www.sfdph.org/directives)
- Social Distancing Protocol (see Appendix A of the Shelter in Place Health Order, posted at www.sfdph.org/healthorders)

All gym services <u>must</u> be provided outdoors including, but not limited to, therapy or other services unless such services are permitted under the <u>Ambulatory Care Directive</u>.

- Indoor spaces such as locker rooms, shower facilities, changing areas, lounges and lobbies must remain closed to customers and the general public.
 - Customers may enter an establishment to:
 - use the restroom. Outdoor gyms should encourage customers to use the restroom before coming to the gym. Customers must <u>not</u> use the restroom solely to wash their hands and must sanitize their hands before entering the facility;
 - reach an outdoor space that is only accessible by traveling through the establishment;
 - access space that currently qualifies as an In-Store Retail business. Must comply with all applicable Health Officer Orders.



- Outdoor Gyms may, subject to any applicable permit requirements, conduct their operations
 under a tent, canopy, or other sun or weather shelter, but only so long as not more than one
 side is closed, allowing sufficient outdoor air movement. Ventilation is key to mitigating the
 spread of COVID-19.
- Outdoor Gyms must address potential hazards and comply with state and local laws, regulations and permitting requirements.
- For more information about setting up your outdoor space please visit San Francisco's Shared Spaces Program at https://sf.gov/shared-spaces.
- Outdoor Gyms must be in compliance with the <u>Cal/OSHA Guide to Electrical Safety</u> and the <u>Cal/OSHA standards</u> for heat illness prevention.

Physical Distancing:

- Customers and personnel must maintain physical distancing of at least six feet from people outside their household at ALL TIMES.
 - Evaluate the outdoor space to determine the number of people (including customers and personnel) who may safely fit in the Outdoor Gym area.
 - Whenever possible set up work-out stations so customers are facing away from each other.
 - o It is highly recommended that Outdoor Gyms create a reservation system to manage capacity for gym access and high-use equipment.
 - Gyms are responsible for maintaining the six-foot separation between customers and personnel. Using signage, floor tape and/or directional guidance can help to ensure physical distancing as personnel and customers move around the space.
- Customers should engage in self-directed fitness, for example, customers may individually use treadmills, free weights or other fitness equipment.
- Outdoor Gyms are encouraged to set aside spaces or times for use by community members who are vulnerable to poor health outcomes from COVID-19.

Screening:

- Customers must be screened before entering the Outdoor Gym and if they answer yes to any of the following, they must **not** enter the Outdoor Gym. See the forthcoming Screening Document here: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/covid-screening.pdf
 - Have you tested positive or have come in close contact with a person who has tested positive for COVID-19 in the past 14 days?
 - O Have you recently felt feverish or had other COVID-19 symptoms which are new or not explained by a pre-existing condition that day or within the preceding 24 hours, such as cough, shortness of breath, sore throat, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, tiredness, chills, headache, muscle/body aches, confusion or loss of taste/smell?



Facial Coverings:

 Customers and personnel must wear a Face Covering at all times they are present at an Outdoor Gym. If anyone refuses, the Outdoor Gym must refuse service and request the customer leave the facility for the day. See <u>Health Order C19-12c</u>, the Face Covering Order, for more information and exemptions.

Sanitation Requirements:

- Outdoor Gyms must develop a plan and implement sanitation requirements that exceed standard industry requirements.
 - Must provide a washing station or hand sanitizer or sanitizing wipes for customers and personnel.
 - Require personnel to regularly clean and disinfect high touch areas and surfaces, fitness machines, gear, accessories, sanitation stations and other equipment throughout the day following CDC guidelines found at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/cleaning-disinfection.html
 - Require customers to disinfect any fitness machine, accessories or other equipment before and after each use. Make disinfectant spray and wipes available for customers at convenient locations. Ensure that lined, non-touch trash receptacles are available. Post signage to remind customers of this requirement.
 - Disinfecting products must be approved for use against COVID-19. An approved list can be found at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/cleaning-disinfection.html
 - O Wherever possible, install touchless, automatic water dispensers for use with personal, reusable water bottles or single-use, disposable paper cups. Display signage reminding Personnel and customers that the bottle or cups should not touch the water dispenser. If a touchless water dispenser is not feasible, remind workers and patrons to wash their hands or use proper hand sanitizer before and after touching the water release button on drinking fountains.

Frequently Asked Questions

I've created the plans, so am I done now?

At least on a weekly basis, think about how your business and personnel are doing, how well you are complying with your Health and Safety Plan and your Social Distancing Protocol, and what changes are needed to improve your response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Look for new guidance from the SFDPH Communicable Disease Control and Prevention site (www.sfcdcp.org/covid19) or the frequently updated page on sf.gov with comprehensive resources for businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic.

What if someone at my Outdoor Gym tests positive for COVID-19?

People may be able to transmit the virus 48 to 72 hours before they develop symptoms of COVID-19. Some people **never** develop symptoms and can still transmit the virus.



See SFDPH guidance What to do if Someone at the Workplace Has COVID-19. A list of personnel and customers from the organization will help SFDPH with contact tracing.

Some of our customers use gloves for weightlifting and other exercise activities. Are they allowed?

Customers may wear their gloves while working out but should be reminded about disinfecting and hand washing. Gloves do not replace disinfecting, hand washing or other sanitizing protocols.

What about towels?

Encourage guests to bring their own towels. If your establishment decides to provide towel service, used towels will need to be stored in a lidded container. Personnel who handle dirty laundry should wear gloves. Launder items according to the manufacturer's instructions. Use the warmest appropriate water setting and dry items completely. Towels, whether provided by the establishment or brought by the guests do not replace the requirement to disinfect fitness machines, accessories, or other equipment used by the customers.

What if our guests want to be spotted when they are lifting weights? Can gym personnel spot them?

NO. Guests can only be spotted by someone from their own household.

Resources

- Printable resources available in the COVID-19 toolkit.
 - o https://sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19
- San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)
 - o https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19
- San Francisco Department of Public Health Health Orders
 - o https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/coronavirus-health-directives.asp
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
 - List of Guidance documents
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/communication/guidance-list.html

<u>City and County of San Francisco Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27 – Exhibit D</u> <u>Screening Handout (September 8, 2020)</u>

Each facility must screen Personnel, customers, and other visitors prior to entry. Go to www.sfcdcp.org/covid19 for more info or a copy of this form.

Part 1 – You must answer the following questions every day before entering this facility.

- 1. Within the last 10 days have you been diagnosed with COVID-19 or had a test confirming you have the virus?
- 2. Do you live in the same household with, or have you had close contact (see reverse side of this sheet) with someone who in the past 14 days was diagnosed with COVID-19 or had a test confirming they have the virus?

If the answer to either question is "yes", do not enter the facility and follow the steps listed in Part 2 below.

3. Have you had one or more of these symptoms today (based on your age group) or within the past 24 hours, which is new or not explained by a pre-existing condition?

For ALL ages:

- Fever or temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C)
- Sore throat

Diarrhea

For ADULTS 18 years old or older:

- Cough
- Shortness of breath
- Chills

- Headache
- Body Aches
- Fatique

- Loss of taste or smell
- Runny nose
- Nasal congestion
- For YOUTH under 18 years old:
- New uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline)
- Vomiting
- Abdominal pain
- New onset of severe headache, especially with a fever

If the answer to Question 3 is "yes", do not enter the facility and follow the steps listed in Part 3 below.

Part 2 -

• If you answered **yes to Question 1:** you are subject to the Health Officer <u>Isolation</u> Directive.

Follow Isolation Steps at: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf

• If you answered **yes to Question 2**: you are subject to the Health Officer <u>Quarantine</u> Directive.

Follow Quarantine Steps at: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf

Do not socialize with others until the Isolation or Quarantine Steps tell you it is safe to do so!

Part 3 – If you answered yes to Question 3:

You may have COVID-19 and must be tested for the virus in order to know if you have the virus. Follow these steps:

- 1. Contact your usual healthcare provider about getting tested for the virus, or sign up for free testing at CityTestSF https://sf.gov/get-tested-covid-19-citytestsf.
- 2. Wait for your test results at home while minimizing exposure to those you live with. A good resource is https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html
- 3. If your result is positive (confirms that you have the virus) go to *Part 2* above and follow **Isolation Steps.**
- 4. If your result is negative, do not socialize with others until you have had at least **24 hours** without fever or other symptoms.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR MORE INFORMATION
If you have questions about any part of this Handout, please call 3-1-1

<u>City and County of San Francisco Health Officer Directive No. 2020-27 – Exhibit D</u> <u>Screening Handout (September 8, 2020)</u>

Questions

What do I do if I answered "yes" to a question on the reverse side based on the listed symptoms?

It is important that you take whatever steps you can to stay safe and healthy right now. You cannot enter the facility because you will put others at risk of getting the virus that causes COVID-19.

If you are feeling sick, you should talk to your healthcare provider. If you are feeling very ill, you may want to contact an urgent care center. If this is an emergency, you should call 9-1-1 or seek care from a hospital.

How do I know if I am a Close Contact for Question 2 on the reverse side of this handout?

In order to determine if you are a "close contact", answer the following questions:

- 1) Have you been around another person who in the last 14 days either has or had a COVID-19 diagnosis or has or had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection? (A "COVID-19 Positive Person")
- 2) Were you around the COVID-19 Positive Person during the period any time between 48 hours before they had symptoms or had a confirmed infection and the time after their symptoms or infection resolved?
- 3) During that same period, did the COVID-19 Positive Person do <u>any</u> of the following:
 - a) Live or stay overnight with you;
 - b) Was your sexual partner;
 - c) Took care of you or allowed you to take care of them;
 - d) Stayed within 6 feet of you for more than 15 minutes (regardless of whether they were or were not wearing a face covering); or
 - e) Exposed you to direct contact with their body fluids or secretions (such as coughing or sneezing on you) while you were not wearing a face mask, gown, and gloves?

If you answered yes to <u>all</u> of 1), 2), <u>and</u> 3), then you are a "close contact".

The meaning of Close Contact is explained in more detail in the Isolation and Quarantine Guidance, which is available online at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/covid-guidance/Guidance-Isolation-and-Quarantine.pdf



Department of Public Health Health Officer Directive

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-26

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR SPECIALIZED TARGETED SUPPORT SERVICES

(PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: September 4, 2020

By this Directive, the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Health Officer") issues industry-specific direction that schools offering specialized targeted support services as described below must follow as part of the local response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic. This Directive constitutes industry-specific guidance as provided under Section 4.e of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h issued on September 1, 2020 (the "Stay-Safer-At-Home Order") and, unless otherwise defined below, initially capitalized terms used in this Directive have the same meaning given them in that order. This Directive goes into effect at 8:00a.m. on September 8, 2020, and remains in effect until suspended, superseded, or amended by the Health Officer. This Directive has support in the bases and justifications set forth in the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. As further provided below, this Directive automatically incorporates any revisions to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order or other future orders issued by the Health Officer that supersede that order or reference this Directive. This Directive is intended to promote best practices as to Social Distancing Requirements and sanitation measures, helping prevent the transmission of COVID-19 and safeguard the health of workers, children, their families, and the community.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Section 5.a.3 of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order allows transitional kindergarten (TK)-12 schools to operate to provide in-person specialized and targeted support services to vulnerable children and youth. This Directive applies to TK-12 schools that choose to offer such services at locations within the City and County of San Francisco.
- 2. For purposes of the Stay-Safer-At-Homer Order and this directive,
 - a. Specialized and targeted support services includes any of the following:
 - Occupational and physical therapy services;
 - Speech and language services;
 - Behavioral services, including ABA therapy or individual counseling if part of an individualized educational program (IEP) or individual family support plan (IFSP);
 - Educational support services as part of a targeted intervention strategy; and
 - assessments such as, but not limited to, those related to English learner status, IEPs, and other student support plans.



Department of Public Health Health Officer Directive

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26

- b. Vulnerable children and youth means:
 - Children and youth with disabilities who receive or are being considered for special education services or other specialized support services (these students should be given highest priority);
 - Children and youth who are clients of Family and Children's Services (FCS) or are at risk of abuse, neglect, or exploitation;
 - Children and youth experiencing homelessness;
 - Foster children:
 - Children of domestic violence survivors;
 - English learners; and
 - Children and youth from families experiencing housing or food insecurity.
- 3. All schools offering specialized and targeted support services must comply with all applicable requirements of: (a) the California Department of Public Health's Guidance for Small Cohorts/Groups of Children and Youth (available at https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/small-groups-child-youth.aspx), and (b) the San Francisco Department of Public Health's guidance for Out of School Time Programs, which is attached as Exhibit A.
- 4. Each school offering specialized and targeted support services must create, adopt, and implement a written health and safety plan (a "Health and Safety Plan"). The Health and Safety Plan must be substantially in the form attached to this Directive as Exhibit B.
- 5. Each school offering specialized and targeted support services must (a) make the Health and Safety Plan available upon request to all Personnel working on site and to the parent(s) or guardian(s) of each child it serves, (b) provide a summary of the plan to all Personnel working on site or otherwise in the City in relation to its operations, and (c) post the plan at the entrance to any other physical location that at which the school is offering specialized and targeted support services within the City. Also, each school offering specialized and targeted support services must provide a copy of the Health and Safety Plan and evidence of its implementation to any authority enforcing this Directive or the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order upon demand.
- 6. Each school offering specialized and targeted support services must require the parent/guardian of each child who participates in the program to sign an acknowledgement of health risks containing the following language:

The collective effort and sacrifice of San Francisco residents staying at home limited the spread of COVID-19. But community transmission of COVID-19 within San Francisco continues, including transmission by individuals who are infected and contagious, but have no symptoms. Infected persons are contagious 48 hours before developing symptoms ("pre-symptomatic"), and many are contagious without ever developing



Department of Public Health Health Officer Directive

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26

symptoms ("asymptomatic"). Pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic people are likely unaware that they have COVID-19.

The decision by the Health Officer to allow schools to offer in-person specialized and targeted support services at facilities that follow required safety rules, does not mean that attending such programs is free of risk. Enrolling a child in such a program could increase the risk of the child becoming infected with COVID-19. While the majority of children who become infected do well, there is still much more to learn about coronavirus in children, including from recent reports of Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C).

Each parent or guardian must determine for themselves if they are willing to take the risk of enrolling their child in school provided in-person specialized and targeted support services, including whether they need to take additional precautions to protect the health of their child and others in the household. They should particularly consider the risks to household members who are adults 60 years or older, or anyone who has an underlying medical condition. Parents and guardians may want to discuss these risks and their concerns with their pediatrician or other health care provider.

More information about COVID-19, MIS-C, and those at higher risk for serious illness is available on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/.

I understand the risks associated with enrolling my child in in-person specialized and targeted support services, and agree to assume the risks to my child and my household. I also agree to follow all safety requirements that the school imposes as a condition of enrolling my child.

- 7. Schools offering specialized and targeted support services in groups must limit the group size ("cohort") to a maximum of 14 children or youth per room or space, or the maximum number of children or youth able to maintain at least six feet of social distancing, whichever is lower. To minimize the risk of transmission, cohorts should be limited to the smallest size possible.
- 8. One-to-one specialized services can be provided to a child or youth by a support service provider who is not part of the child or youth's cohort. These additional services must be done individually and cannot be done with other students. Staff who are providing one-to-one specialized services should be assigned to work with students in as few cohorts as possible. Although staff who are providing one-to-one specialized services are not required to maintain physical distance from children and youth (to the extent necessary to provide the service), they must observe appropriate precautions to prevent transmission, including wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE).
- 9. Specialized and targeted support services that are provided in groups must last for no fewer than 3 weeks.



Department of Public Health Health Officer Directive

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26

- 10. Schools offering specialized and targeted support services subject to this Directive must provide items such as Face Coverings (as provided in Health Order No. C19-12c issued on July 22, 2020, and any future amendment to that order), hand sanitizer or handwashing stations, or both, and disinfectant and related supplies to any of that OST Program's Personnel. If any OST Program is unable to provide these required items to Personnel or otherwise fails to comply with required Guidance, then it must cease operating until it can fully comply and demonstrate its strict compliance. Further, as to any non-compliant operation, any such OST Program is subject to immediate closure and the fines and other legal remedies described below, as a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order.
- 11. For purposes of this Directive, "Personnel" includes all of the following people who provide goods or services associated with the Host in the City: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the business); vendors who are permitted to sell goods onsite (such as farmers or others who sell at stalls in farmers' markets); volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Host. "Personnel" includes "gig workers" who perform work via the business's app or other online interface, if any.
- 12. This Directive may be revised by the Health Officer, through revision of this Directive or another future directive or order, as conditions relating to COVID-19 require, in the discretion of the Health Officer. All OST Programs must stay updated regarding any changes to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order and this Directive by checking the Department of Public Health website (www.sfdph.org/healthorders; www.sfdph.org/directives) regularly.
- 13. Schools offering specialized and targeted support services must prepare, post, and implement a Social Distancing Protocol substantially in the form of Appendix A to the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, as provided under applicable provisions of Section 4.d of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. The OST Program must follow those Best Practices and update them as necessary for the duration of this Directive, including, without limitation, as this Directive is amended or extended in writing by the Health Officer and consistent with any extension of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, any other order that supersedes that order, and any Health Officer order that references this Directive

This Directive is issued in furtherance of the purposes of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. Where a conflict exists between this Directive and any state, local, or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including, without limitation, the Social Distancing Protocol, the most restrictive provision controls. Failure to carry out this Directive is a violation of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order, constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

Date: September 4, 2020

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,

Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26 (Exhibit A)

Guidance

Interim Guidance for Out of School Time Programs

September 1, 2020

This guidance was developed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) for local use. It will be posted at http://www.sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare. This guidance may change as new knowledge emerges and local community transmission changes.

<u>AUDIENCE</u>: Educational and recreational programs that provide care and supervision for school-aged children when they are not attending school in-person, also called out-of-school time (OST) programs. OST programs include afterschool programs, youth sport programs, and in-person programs to support distance learning such as learning hubs, as well as other group care for children and youth not run by schools.

Summary of Changes since the 8/14/2020 Version

Cohort size limit decreased to 14 to match <u>California Department of Public Health (CDPH) guidance on small cohorts/groups of children and youth</u> on 8/25/2020.

PURPOSE: To help OST programs understand health and safety practices needed to prevent spread of COVID-19 in their programs.

BACKGROUND: San Francisco Health Orders allow OST programs in San Francisco to open. Many OST programs support remote learning for students, and provide additional in-person support.

Certain precautions, such as wearing cloth face masks, effectively decrease the risk of COVID-19 transmission. Coordinating and layering effective interventions can greatly reduce the risk of COVID-19 for children and for adult staff, whose overall risk of COVID-19 is greater than for children and youth, and their families.

The guidelines below are based on the best science available at this time and the current degree of COVID-19 transmission in San Francisco. They are subject to change as new knowledge emerges and as local community transmission changes.



Contents

Key messages for Programs for Children and Youth	3
Prepare for Opening	3
Strategies to Prevent Spread of COVID-19	5
Screen everyone entering the building for COVID-19.	5
Keep staff, children and youth in small, stable groups ("cohorts")	6
Physical distancing	7
Face masks and cloth face coverings	8
Hand hygiene	10
Ventilation and outdoor spaces	10
Limit sharing	11
Cleaning and disinfection	11
Specific Situations	11
Transportation	11
Drop-off and pick-up	12
Meals and snacks	12
Staff spaces: offices, break rooms and work rooms	
Sports and exercise	
Students receiving special services.	
Other activities	14
What to do when someone has suspected or confirmed COVID-19	14
When a child and youth or staff member has symptoms of COVID-19	14
When a child and youth or staff member has a positive COVID-19 test	14
Posourcos	10



Key messages for Programs for Children and Youth

- Address adult-to-adult transmission, and adults as sources of infection. Most COVID-19 cases in childcare and day camp settings have occurred in staff, not children.
- Preventing person-to-person transmission via respiratory transmission is more important than
 frequent cleaning and disinfection. COVID-19 mainly spreads from person-to-person via
 respiratory droplet in the air.
 - Coronavirus is easy to kill on surfaces compared to norovirus.
 Most household cleaning products are effective. Professional deep cleaning services are generally unnecessary.
- The use of personal protective equipment (PPE) does not eliminate the need for physical
 distancing, portable barriers/partitions and universal face coverings. PPE can give people a false
 sense of security. Physical distancing, barriers and face coverings are important in preventing the
 spread of COVID-19 in OST program settings.
- **Exposure risk lies along a continuum**. A rule of thumb is that a person must spend at least 15 minutes within 6 feet of someone with COVID-19 to be at risk of infection.
 - Spending less time together is lower-risk than more time; being further apart is better than being closer together.
 - Smaller group sizes are better than larger, outdoor settings are better than indoor ones.
 - More people using face coverings is better than fewer people using face coverings.
 - Activities that produce fewer respiratory droplets are lower risk than those that produce many droplets (silence < quiet talking < loud talking < singing).
- Adult staff are at higher risk of severe COVID-19 than children. Recommendations for distancing and face coverings should prioritize staff safety and maximal protection of staff.

Prepare for Opening

- Designate a COVID-19 staff liaison to be the single point of contact at each site for questions or concerns around practices, protocols, or potential exposure. This person will also serve as a liaison to SFDPH.
- Establish health and safety protocols to prevent COVID-19 transmission.
 - Train staff and teach children and youth about health and safety practices. Avoid having in-person staff development, meetings, or team-building during the two weeks before the OST program opens or during the program if possible.
 - Create a health and safety plan outlining what the program will do to implement the requirements in this guidance and any relevant Health Officer Directives or orders. Share this plan with staff, families, and other members of the your program's community.
- Work with SFDPH to develop a strategy to regularly test all OST staff for COVID-19, even if they do
 not have COVID-19 symptoms or exposure ("surveillance testing"). For example, a program might
 test all staff over 2 months by testing 25% of staff are tested every 2 weeks, or 50% every month.
 Programs may not be able to do surveillance testing during times when labs do not have enough
 tests, and must prioritize people with COVID-19 symptoms or exposure.



 Establish protocols for staff, children and youth with symptoms of COVID-19 and for communication with staff, children and youth, and families after COVID-19 exposure or a confirmed COVID-19 case in the facility.

Staff Considerations

Protect staff, especially those at higher risk of severe COVID-19 illness. See sfcdcp.org/covid19hcp for a list of groups at higher risk for severe COVID-19.

- Staff at higher risk for severe COVID-19 illness should not be assigned to screen children and youth for symptoms or monitor/care for sick children waiting to be picked up.
- Consider the use of a portable plexiglass barrier or other barrier, or use a clear window for staff when screening for COVID-19 symptoms (persons entering the building, children who feel sick).
- Consider the use of face shields, to be used with face coverings, for staff. If supplies of face shields
 are limited, prioritize them for staff who are in groups at higher-risk of severe COVID-19 illness.
- Plan ahead for staff absences in case community transmission of COVID-19 increases. Recruit
 people experienced caring for children and youth to ensure that you have a roster of substitute
 caregivers who can fill in. For more information, see SFDPH return-to-work guidelines at
 https://www.sfcdcp.org/rtw.

Children and Youth Enrollment Considerations

- Prioritize enrollment of the following groups:
 - At-risk children and youth, including:
 - Children and youth who are clients of Family and Children's Services (FCS) or are at risk of abuse, neglect, or exploitation
 - Children eligible through the Emergency Childcare Bridge Program for Foster Children
 - Children and youth experiencing homelessness
 - Foster children
 - Children of domestic violence survivors
 - Children and youth with disabilities or special health care needs whose individualized education programs (IEP) and/or individual family support plans (IFSP) include ELC services
 - Children and youth from low-income families, including those who receive or are eligible for free or reduced school lunch, Medi-Cal, SNAP (food stamps), WIC, Head Start, CalWorks and other public assistance programs.
 - Children and youth of people who work in essential businesses or essential governmental functions, followed by people who work in other businesses and organizations that are allowed to remain open or re-open under San Francisco Health Orders.
- Do not exclude children and youth because of medical conditions such as diabetes, asthma, leukemia and other malignancies, and autoimmune diseases that may put them at higher risk of severe COVID-19. Allow the child's medical team and family to determine whether in-person attendance is safe.



Strategies to Prevent Spread of COVID-19

Screen everyone entering the building for COVID-19.

 Ask <u>all</u> persons entering the childcare facility about COVID-19 symptoms and and exposure to COVID-19, including staff, children, parents/caregivers, contractors, and visitors. Emergency personnel responding to a 9-1-1 call are exempted.



- Do not allow people who answer "yes" to any of the screening questions to enter the facility.
- Programs may also choose to require temperature checks of people entering the building, either on-site or done by parents at home. SFDPH does not require temperature checks.
 - For specific guidance on conducting symptom screening and temperature checks, see
 COVID-19 Health Checks at Programs for Children and Youth (children) and
 Asking COVID-19 Screening Questions at Any Business, Organization or Facility (adults)

Staff, children and youth who are sick must stay home.

- Remind parents to keep children home when ill. A parent/guardian handout, "COVID-19 Health Checks/If Your Child has Symptoms" is available at https://sfcdcp.org/covidschoolschildcare.
- Implement sick leave policies that support staff to stay home when ill.
- Encourage family members of children and youth and staff to get tested promptly if they have symptoms of COVID-19, to lower the risk of spread to children or staff.
- Encourage children and staff to stay home for 14 days after traveling out of the San Francisco Bay Area, if their activities during their trip put them at risk for COVID-19 infection. This does not apply to staff and children who regularly commute to childcare from places outside of the San Francisco Bay Area. Higher-risk activities include:
 - Spending time within 6 feet of people outside their household when not wearing face masks, especially if indoors.
 - Travel on planes, buses, trains, or other vehicles shared with people outside their household when face coverings were not worn at all times by all passengers.

Restrict non-essential visitors.

- Allow only volunteers who are essential to the program operations. Volunteers should commit to regular, scheduled participation for at least 3 weeks duration.
- Therapists who are not OST programs employees but work with children and youth on-site at OST programs, such as ABA therapists, occupational therapists and physical therapists, are considered essential staff and should be allowed to provide services. See section titled "Students receiving special services"
- Discourage parents and other family members from entering the building.
- Cancel special events that involve parents and families, such as festivals, holiday events, and performances.





Keep staff, children and youth in small, stable groups ("cohorts").

A cohort is a stable group that has the same staff, children and youth each day, stays together for all activities (e.g., snacks, recess, etc.), and avoids contact with people outside the group. Keeping staff, children and youth in the same small cohort each day lowers their exposure risk by limiting the number of people they interact with.

Limit cohort size

- Limit cohort size to a maximum of 14 children or youth, as currently required.
- Have a minimum of 2 staff or trained volunteers supervising each group.
- Minors ages 14-17 years of age who are employed as program staff, including interns, are not included in the maximum number of children per group.
- The maximum cohort size applies to all children and youth in the cohort, even if not all children attend the OST program at the same time. For example,
 - A cohort may not include 6 children who attend full-time, 6 children on Mon/Wed/Fri, and 6 children on Tue/Thu (total of 18).
 - A cohort may not include 8 children who attend for the entire day, 4 who attend mornings only, and 4 who attend afternoons only (total of 16).

Keep stable cohorts with the same staff, children and youth. Avoid changes to cohorts.

- Newly enrolled children and youth may join a cohort at any time, but they must enroll for a period
 of at least 3 weeks. Do not allow children to attend for shorter periods.
- Children and youth must only participate in one program at a time, even if they occur on different days of the week. For example, a child may not attend both a learning hub M-F and a Saturday youth sports program.
- Staff should be assigned to one cohort and must work only with that cohort. Staff may not work with more than one cohort of children or youth. Avoid changing staff assignments if possible.
 - Substitute providers who are covering for short-term staff absences are allowed, but must only work with one cohort of children per day.
 - o "Floaters," who provide brief coverage for providers throughout the day, must only work with one cohort of children per day.



Keep cohorts from mixing.

- Each cohort must be in a separate room or space.
- Minimize interactions between cohorts, including interactions between staff assigned to different cohorts.
 - Assign children and youth who live together or carpool together to the same cohort, if possible and if consistent with age and learning concerns.
 - For specialist activities such as art and music, staff may cross between cohorts to meet children's educational and enrichment needs. Limit staff movement between cohorts as much as possible. Staff should document visits that are not part of their cohort. Consider using a sign-in sheet/log to keep track of when staff have worked with different cohorts, to help you trace which students and staff were exposed to COVID-19 after a COVID-19 case occurs in the program.
 - Stagger playground time and other activities so that no two cohorts are in the same place at the same time.
 - Avoid moving children and youth from one cohort to another, unless needed for a child's overall safety and wellness.

Partition large indoor spaces to prevent direct air flow between cohorts.

A room divider or partition may be used to allow more than one cohort to use a large indoor space if the following requirements are met:

- All cohorts are from the same program.
- Staff, children and youth do not need to enter another cohort's space to access bathrooms, kitchens, other common areas or exits. If one cohort must pass through another cohort's space to access bathrooms, kitchens, exits or other common areas, use partitions to separate the pass-through space from both cohorts.
- The room divider must prevent direct air flow between cohorts.
 - Best Practice: Solid, non-permeable, cleanable partitions extending to as close to the ceiling as practical to reduce direct and indirect air flow between cohorts.
 - Minimum Requirement: Solid non-permeable, cleanable partitions extending from the floor and at least 8 feet high.
- The room divider must <u>not</u>:
 - Interfere with ventilation of each space. If mechanical ventilation is used, supply and return diffusers must be present on each side of the partitions
 - Obstruct sprinkler systems, access to emergency exits and other fire and building codes.

If smoke detectors are required and/or are in use in the building, separate smoke detectors may be required on each side of the room divider. Seek consultation as needed for each facility.

Physical distancing

Physical distancing decreases the risk of COVID-19 from respiratory droplets.



- During individual activities, such as when using a computer, keep children at least 6 feet apart.
- Have children sit in the same seats each day if possible.
- Rearrange furniture and work/play spaces to prevent crowding and promote physical distancing between children who are not playing together.
- Arrange desks, workstations, or computers facing in the same direction, so that children do not sit facing each other.
- Offer more opportunities for individual activities, such as reading, workbooks, painting or crafts. Choose group activities that do not involve close contact between children.
- Do not hold gatherings like sing-alongs, and other activities that bring different cohorts together, even if outdoors wearing face coverings.
- During group activities, such as playtime, physical distancing may be relaxed, especially for younger children who may have difficulty staying 6 feet apart from each other, especially if children are wearing face coverings or outside.

Maintain physical distancing between adults.

- Adults must stay at least 6 feet from other adults, including staff in the same cohort, whenever possible.
 - Set up offices and staff rooms so that staff do not work or sit within 6 feet of each other.
 - Encourage virtual meetings using video conferencing apps for parent-provider meetings and staff meetings, even when all staff are present.
- Adults should stay at least 6 feet away from children and youth as much as possible while meeting their developmental and learning needs.
- If it is not possible to stay 6 feet apart, keep the interaction as short as possible, make sure to wear
 face coverings, and consider wearing a face shield in addition to a face covering, to further provide
 eye protection.

Face masks and cloth face coverings

Face masks and other cloth face coverings keep people from spreading the infection to others, by trapping respiratory droplets before they can travel through the air. They are one of the most important measures to protect staff and children from COVID-19.

- All adults and children 10 years and older must wear face masks or cloth face coverings over <u>both</u> their nose and mouth at all times.
 - Staff, family and visitors may not enter the building unless they are wearing a face covering or have documentation of a medical contraindication to face coverings (in which case, they must wear an alternative face covering, such as a face shield with a drape on the bottom edge, unless a medical professional has provided a written exemption to this alternative face covering requirement). Keep a supply of face coverings for individuals who have forgotten to bring one.
 - Family members must wear face coverings when dropping-off or picking-up a child or youth.



- Children 2-9 years old should use face coverings as much as feasible, especially during the following times:
 - During group activities or playtime when children are not physical distancing, especially indoors.
 - o In situations where children may encounter staff and children from other cohorts, for example, at drop-off and pickup, and in hallways, bathrooms and outside play areas.
 - If a child becomes ill after arriving and is waiting for pick-up.
- Reusable cloth face masks are recommended over surgical masks, which should be reserved for medical personnel, and can be sent home with families to be laundered.
- Avoid excluding children from the program or disciplining them for not wearing a face covering.
 Continue to encourage and remind them to wear their face covering. A child who refuses to wear face coverings at home may be more willing to wear a face covering in a setting where all staff and other children are wearing them.

The widespread use of face coverings can significantly reduce the spread of infection, even if a few children are unable to wear face coverings. Consistent face covering use by adults is very important in preventing the spread of COVID-19, since many cases of COVID-19 in youth settings so far have been adult staff who were infected in the community.

Exemptions to cloth face coverings; use of face shields

- Children 0-1 year old must not wear face coverings due to the risk of suffocation.
- When a person is unconscious, asleep, or otherwise unable to remove the face covering independently.
- Children and youth with documented medical or behavioral contraindications to face coverings are
 exempt. This includes children and youth who are unable to tolerate face coverings due to autism
 or sensory sensitivity, or children and youth unable to independently remove face coverings due
 to developmental delay or disability.
- Staff with a medical contraindication documented by a medical provider to a face covering may be
 allowed to wear a face shield with a cloth drape on the bottom tucked into the top of their shirt.
 However, this is not thought to be as effective as a face covering in preventing spread of infection.
 https://covid19.ca.gov/masks-and-ppe/
- Staff working with children and youth who are hard-of-hearing may use a clear mask (a disposable
 or cloth face mask with a clear window). If this is not feasible, a face shield with a cloth drape
 tucked into the shirt may also be used. Staff must wear a face covering at other times, for
 example, in staff-only areas.
- Do not use face shields in place of face coverings unless absolutely required, such when working
 with hard of hearing children and youth. Face shields have not been shown to keep the wearer
 from infecting others.
- Consider using a face shield in addition to a face mask or cloth face covering. Face shields provide
 additional eye protection for the wearer. When used with a mask or face covering, a cloth drape is
 not needed.



Hand hygiene

Frequent handwashing for at least 20 seconds and hand sanitizer use removes COVID-19 germs from people's hands before they can infect themselves by touching their eyes, nose or mouth.

- Develop routines and schedules for staff, children and youth to wash or sanitize their hands at staggered intervals, especially before and after eating, upon entering/re-entering a space, and before and after touching shared equipment such as computer keyboards.
- Every space and common area (staff work rooms, eating areas) should have hand sanitizer or a place to wash hands upon entering.
- Establish procedures to ensure that sinks and handwashing stations do not run out of soap or paper towels, and that hand sanitizer does not run out.
- Post signs encouraging hand hygiene. A hand hygiene sign in multiple languages is available for download at http://eziz.org/assets/docs/IMM-825.pdf

Ventilation and outdoor spaces

Increasing outdoor air circulation lowers the risk of infection by "diluting" any infectious respiratory droplets with outdoor air. Being outside is even lower risk.

- Do as many activities outside as possible, especially snacks/meals and physical activities.
- Stagger use of outdoor spaces to keep cohorts from mixing. If the outdoor space is large enough, consider designating separate spaces for each cohort.
- Open windows to increase ventilation with outdoor air when health and safety allow, for example, when it does not worsen individuals' allergies or asthma. When health and safety allow, also consider also leaving room doors slightly open to promote flow of outdoor air through the indoor space.
- Adjust mechanical ventilation systems to maximize fresh (outdoor) air ventilation. Minimize or eliminate return or recirculated air.
- For mechanical ventilation systems, increasing the intake of outdoor air and minimizing recirculated air should be prioritized over increasing filter efficiency during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Generally, opening windows and adjusting mechanical ventilation systems to maximize outdoor air intake will effectively increase the amount of outdoor air in a room. Although increased filter efficiency may be desirable for other reasons, such as improving indoor air quality near freeways or during wildfires, it is less important than maximizing outdoor air intake for COVID-19. Improving filter efficiency may require significant upgrades to the mechanical ventilation system. Portable air cleaners may be considered, but must be sized and positioned appropriately for the specific space.

Limit sharing

- Limit sharing of art supplies, school supplies, manipulatives, and other high-touch materials as much as possible. If feasible, have a separate set of supplies for each child and youth.
- Limit use of shared playground equipment in favor of activities that have less contact with shared surfaces.
- If used, outdoor play structures and natural play areas only need routine maintenance. Make sure the children wash or sanitize their hands before and after using these spaces. When hand hygiene is emphasized, cleaning and disinfection of outdoor play areas is not required between cohorts.

Cleaning and disinfection

Many household disinfectants are effective against COVID-19. Refer to <u>EPA's List N</u> for EPA-approved disinfectants effective against COVID-19.

- Clean and disinfect frequently touched surfaces at least daily.
- Routine cleaning for COVID-19 should include:
 - Routine cleaning focuses on frequently touched surfaces like door handles, desks, countertops, phones, keyboards, light switches, handles, toilets and faucets.
 - Cleaning after a suspected or known case of COVID-19 uses the same cleaning agents and disinfectants as for routine cleaning, but includes the following steps:
 - Open windows and use fans to increase outdoor air circulation in the areas to be cleaned.
 - Wait 24 hours, or as long as practical, before cleaning and disinfection.
 CDPH recommends waiting at least 1 hour.¹
 - Clean and disinfect all surfaces in the areas used by the ill person, including electronic equipment like tablets, touch screens, keyboards, and remote controls. Vacuum the space if needed.
- For details, refer to CDC guidelines on "Cleaning and Disinfecting Your Facility" at
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html
 and CDC guidelines for cleaning schools and community facilities at
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/cleaning-disinfection.htm
 l#Cleaning
- Note that the term "deep cleaning" can be misleading, and the CDC does not use the term.

Specific Situations

Transportation

Since vehicles are small enclosed spaces that do not allow physical distancing, they can be settings with higher risk of COVID-19 transmission. Biking and walking are lower risk than shared vehicles.

ODPH Outpatient Healthcare Facility Infection Control Recommendations for Suspect COVID-19 Patients https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/OutpatientHealthcareFacilityInfectionControlRecommendationsforSuspectCOVID19Patients.aspx



- Public transportation: Wear face coverings, maintain at least 6 feet of 6ft physical distancing as much as possible, and practice hand hygiene upon arrival.
- Carpools and shared rides: Advise staff and families to carpool with the same stable group of people. Open windows and maximize outdoor air circulation when feasible. Everyone in the vehicle used for these purposes must wear a face covering.

Drop-off and pick-up

Children, youth and parents/caregivers from different households should not gather and interact with each other during arrival and dismissal, as this creates an opportunity for COVID-19 to spread in the community.

Limit staff contact with families at drop-off and pick-up

- Stagger arrival and dismissal times to minimize contact, using different entrances/exits for each cohort when possible.
- Mark spaces at least 6 feet apart for children and youth waiting to enter the building and for adults waiting to pick up children. Post signs to remind family members to stay at least 6 feet away from people from other households when dropping off or picking up their student.
- Face coverings are required for adults who are dropping off or picking up children and youth.

Meals and snacks

Eating together is especially high risk for COVID-19 transmission because people must remove their face coverings to eat and drink. Children and youth often eat with their hands, and both children and adults often touch their mouths with their hands while eating. In addition, meals are usually considered time for talking together, which further increases risk, especially if children and youth must speak loudly to be heard.

- Eating outdoors is safer than eating indoors. Outdoor eating areas may be covered (e.g. with an
 awning), as long as no more than one side is closed, allowing sufficient air movement. Designate
 an eating area for each group, and mark places at least 6 feet apart for students to sit. Without
 marked spaces, children might sit more closely.
- Use individually plated or bagged meals or snacks instead of family-style meals.
- Space children and youth as far apart as possible when eating, and try to seat them so they do not sit face-to-face. Physical distancing is especially important when eating, since face coverings cannot be worn.
- Make sure that children and youth and staff wash their hands or use hand sanitizer immediately before and after eating. Pay special attention to children who like to suck/lick food off their hands.
- Staff should try as much as possible to stay at least 6 feet away from children who are not wearing
 face coverings, especially when they are eating indoors. Staff should remember to wear face
 coverings if children are eating.
- Clean and disinfect tables and chairs between different cohorts. If eating outdoors, sidewalks and asphalt do not have to be disinfected.



Staff spaces: offices, break rooms and work rooms

Staff often do not view themselves and colleagues as sources of infection, and forget to take precautions with co-workers, especially during social interactions such as breaks or lunch time.

- Staff should try not to eat with other staff, especially indoors. This is a common way that staff are exposed to COVID-19 at work.
- Post signage reminding staff to stay 6 feet apart, keep their face coverings on unless eating, wash their hands before and after eating, and disinfect their area after using it.
- Consider creating a private outdoor area for staff to eat and take breaks.
- Open windows and doors to maximize ventilation in staff spaces.

Sports and exercise

Exercising is an area of higher risk for transmission due to the potential for close contact and increased breathing. Youth sports require special consideration and special precautions. Any program that involves sports or physical education, as all or part of its programming, must comply with these guidelines.

- All sports, physical conditioning, and training must occur outside.
- Participants must stay at least 6 feet apart at all times. Sports that require closer contact are not
 permitted. Physical conditioning and individual training to support such sports (e.g., running drills,
 practicing skills, and doing calisthenics) is permitted as long participants can stay 6 feet apart at all
 times.
- Face coverings must be worn by all participants at all times (participants should avoid heavy
 exertion because it may make wearing face coverings more difficult).
- Limit sharing of equipment between youth in a cohort. Clean any shared equipment frequently. Do not share equipment between cohorts unless it has been cleaned and disinfected.
- Youth from different cohorts may not play against or with each other.
- Tournaments, events, and competitions are not permitted.
- Please see the state's guidance regarding Youth Sports at https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Youth-Sports-FAQ.aspx.

Students receiving special services

- Therapists and other support staff are considered essential staff and should be allowed onsite to provide services.
- Accommodations and related services for special education, learning disabilities and medical
 conditions should be met, even if it creates cross-over between cohorts. Provide supervision for
 children who need additional support maintaining physical distancing, wearing a face covering, or
 handwashing.
- Additional accommodations may be needed for students to safely attend class. For example, a student who cannot tolerate a face covering due to a medical or developmental condition may need a desk with clear screens or privacy barriers.



Other activities

- Avoid group singing. Suspend choir and wind instruments (band). These activities are higher risk
 for COVID-19 transmission due to the larger numbers of respiratory droplets produced. Percussion
 and string instruments are allowed.
- Field trips are currently not allowed due to the potential for increased transmission. Please stay updated with state and local guidance.

What to do when someone has suspected or confirmed COVID-19

Refer to "When someone has suspected or confirmed COVID-19: Quick Guide for Schools, Childcares, and Programs for Children and Youth" at https://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare for information on:

- Steps to take when staff or children and youth have COVID-19 symptoms, have been exposed (for example, a parent or sibling has tested positive), or have confirmed COVID-19.
- Returning to the program after COVID-19 symptoms, close contact, or confirmed COVID-19.

When a child and youth or staff member has symptoms of COVID-19

- Staff who develop symptoms at work must notify their supervisor and leave work as soon as
 feasible. For SFDPH guidance on when workers with COVID-19 symptoms may return to work, see
 https://sfcdcp.org/rtw.
- Keep ill children and youth in a separate area, away from other children and youth, until they can be picked up. Make sure that children and youth keep their face coverings on.
- When a parent or guardian arrives, consider walking the child outside to meet them instead of
 allowing the parent or guardian into the building. Since it is common that children with COVID-19
 are infected by a parent or other adult in their home, the parent may also have COVID-19.
- Encourage family members of students and staff with symptoms of COVID-19 to get tested promptly, before they can spread infection to students and staff.
- Open windows in areas used by the sick person to maximize outdoor air circulation. Close off those areas as soon as feasible, until they can be cleaned and disinfected.
- Children and youth with symptoms may return to the program when they have met the criteria in
 "When someone has suspected or confirmed COVID-19: Quick Guide for Schools, Childcares, and
 Programs for Children and Youth." A parent handout, "For Parents and Guardians: COVID-19
 Health Checks for Children and Youth/If Your Child Has Symptoms" is also available. Both
 documents are at http://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare.

When a child and youth or staff member has a positive COVID-19 test

 Contact the SFDPH Schools and Childcare Hub for consultation and guidance at (415) 554-2830, Press 1 for COVID-19, then press 6 for Schools Schools-childcaresites@sfdph.org

Guidance



- Work with SFDPH to identify staff, children and youth and other people in the program who had close contact with the person with COVID-19. Individuals who had close contact should be notified, know how to get tested, and understand when they or their child can return to the program, usually 14 days after their last exposure. Please refer to "Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ): COVID-19 Contact Tracing at Schools, Childcares, and Programs for Children and Youth" at http://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare.
- Close the areas used by the person with COVID-19 until they can be cleaned and disinfected.
- Communicate with staff and families.
 Maintain the confidentiality of the child, youth family, or staff member with COVID-19 as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, and possibly HIPAA.

Resources

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)

- SFDPH Schools and Childcare Hub for COVID-19 consultation and guidance (415) 554-2830. Press 1 for COVID-19, then press 6 for Schools Schools-childcaresites@sfdph.org
- COVID-19 guidance for the public, including schools and employers https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19
- Outreach Toolkit for Coronavirus. Posters and flyers on physical distancing, hand hygiene, face masks, health screenings, getting tested, and other COVID-19 topics at https://sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19
- "What to Do When Someone Has Suspected or Confirmed COVID-19: Quick Guide for Schools, Childcares, and Programs for Children and Youth", at https://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare
- "Parent and Caregiver Handout: COVID-19 Health Checks/If Your Child has Symptoms." Instructions
 for parents on health screenings and return to school guidelines if their child has COVID-19
 symptoms, at http://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare
- "Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ): COVID-19 Contact Tracing At Schools, Childcares, and Programs for Children and Youth", at https://sfcdcp.org/CovidSchoolsChildcare
- "What to Do if Someone at the Workplace Tested Positive for COVID-19" https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19 under Businesses and Employers.
- "Leaving Isolation or Returning to Work for Those Who Have Confirmed or Suspected COVID-19" https://www.sfcdcp.org/rtw

California Department of Public Health (CDPH)

- "Guidance for Small Cohorts/Groups of Children and Youth" https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/small-groups-child-youth.aspx
- "Youth Sports Questions and Answers"
 https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Youth-Sports-FAQ.aspx





Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

- Guidance for Schools and Childcare https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/index.html
- Guidance for Child Care Programs that Remain Open
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/guidance-for-childcare.html
- Cleaning and Disinfection for Community Facilities
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/clean-disinfect/index.html



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26 (Exhibit B) Health and Safety Plan (issued 9/4/2020)

Each school offering specialized and targeted support services must complete, post onsite, and follow this Health and Safety Plan.

Check off all items below that apply and list other required information.

Busin	ess/Entity name:	Contact name:
Entity	Address:	Contact telephone:
(You i	may contact the person listed above wit	h any questions or comments about this plan.)
	Business is familiar with and complies Directive No. 2020-26, available at https://html.nc.nih.gov/	with all requirements set forth in Health Officer o://www.sfdph.org/directives.
	Designate a COVID-19 staff liaison. L	iaison name:
		e event a child or staff member has symptoms of erson with COVID-19, or is diagnosed with
	children and youth who are clients of F abuse, neglect, or exploitation, children	h with disabilities (who are given first priority), family and Children's Services or are at risk of and youth experiencing homelessness or children of domestic violence survivors; and
	Everyone who enters the facility is scre	eened for COVID-19 symptoms or exposure.
	Parents are informed to keep children	home when ill.
	Sick leave policies support personnel t	o stay home when ill.
	Limiting non-essential visitors, including	g volunteers, to the greatest extent possible.
	Cohort size is limited to 14 children or facility's license, whichever is lower.	the maximum number of children allowed by the
	Group sessions are a minimum of thre	e weeks long.
	Staff who provide services or supervis cohort and works solely with that coho	on to cohorts of children are assigned to one rt.
	Staff providing one-to-one specialized as few cohorts as possible and observ transmission.	services are assigned to work with students in e appropriate precautions to prevent
	Interaction between cohorts is minimiz	ed to the greatest extent feasible.
		pace <u>or</u> a solid non-permeable, cleanable at least 8 feet high separates the cohorts.
	Physical distancing between adults is	maintained as much as possible.
	Physical distancing between children is nature and location of the activity.	s encouraged as appropriate depending on the



Health Officer Directive No. 2020-26 (Exhibit B) Health and Safety Plan (issued 9/4/2020)

Each school offering specialized and targeted support services must complete, post onsite, and follow this Health and Safety Plan.

	All adults and children in third grade and up wear a face covering unless eating or drinking, as needed for provision of services, or otherwise exempt.
	Children 2 years old through second grade are encouraged to wear face coverings to the extent feasible, especially during the following times:
	 During group activities or playtime when children are not physical distancing, especially indoors;
	 Where children may encounter staff and children from other cohorts; and
	 If a child becomes ill after arriving and is waiting for pick up (and is not asleep)
	Protocols for frequent hand washing and/or sanitizing are in place.
	Activities are done outdoors to the greatest extent possible.
	Ventilation is maximized to the greatest extent possible through opening windows (when safe to do so) and/or adjusting mechanical ventilation to maximize fresh (outdoor) air ventilation, as appropriate.
	Sharing of supplies and high-touch material is limited to the extent possible.
	Frequently touched surfaces, supplies and other objects are cleaned and disinfected regularly.
	Staff contact with families at drop-off and pick-up is limited as much as possible.
	Children are placed as far apart as possible during meals and snacks.
	Sports and physical education are permitted only when at least six feet of physical distance can be maintained between all participants at all times.
	No group singing or playing wind instruments.
	No field trips.
<u>Ad</u>	ditional Measures
Ex	plain:

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>; <u>BOS-Legislative Aides</u>; <u>BOS-Administrative Aides</u>

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)

Subject: FW: Updated LHH/ZSFG SNF Visitation Order (C19-01c) and RCFE/ARF Visitation Order (C19-09b)

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 9:58:00 AM

Attachments: 2020.09.04 FINAL Signed Order Excluding Visitors to SNFs (Order C19-03b) 14 point.pdf

2020.09.04 FINAL Signed Order Excluding Visitors to LHH, ZSFG 4A (Order C19-01c).pdf 2020.09.04 FINAL Signed Order Excluding Visitors to RCFEs, ARFs (Order C19-09b).pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached Orders of the Health Officer Nos. C19-01c, C19-03b, C19-09b.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163 eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Patil, Sneha (DPH) < sneha.patil@sfdph.org> Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 12:56 PM

To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

<eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>

Cc: Katy Tang (AIR) < katy.tang@flysfo.com>

Subject: Updated LHH/ZSFG SNF Visitation Order (C19-01c) and RCFE/ARF Visitation Order (C19-09b)

Hi Angela and Eileen,

Hope you had a nice weekend. You may have already received this - my apologies for the delay in getting this to you (I thought I had sent this on Friday night but it never made it out of my drafts). Please see attached updated orders on SNF and RCFE/ARF visitation. Summary from City Attorney is below.

SNF Visitation order:

- 1. The current order requires basic safety practices to protect visitors, residents, and staff, including use of face coverings, employee screening, following best practices regarding social distancing, etc.
- 2. The current order allows "Essential Visits", which includes end-of-life visits, visits that are necessary for clinical purposes, and visits with lawyers or others

- where an in-person visit is necessary for legal purposes. The ombudsperson is allowed to have in-person meetings with residents but is encouraged to do visits remotely.
- 3. The current order prohibits Non-Essential Personnel from being on campus when the facility determines their presence is not needed for the operation of the facility.
- 4. The new order adds a category of visits called "Allowed Visits", which includes Facility Window Visits, Vehicle Visits, and Outdoor Visits. Each facility should allow at least one addition type of Allowed Visit consistent with what can be done safely, and the facility has broad leeway to control timing, scheduling, duration, and other aspects of such visits. The new order imposes restrictions on the different types of visits, including among others:
 - a. Screening of all visitors, and temperature checks for outdoor visits;
 - b. Maintenance of physical distance;
 - c. Use of a face covering by visitors and, when possible, by residents;
 - d. No exchange or sharing of gifts or other shared items during the visit (but a facility call allow gifts through other means);
 - e. A limit on visit duration of 1 hour, which can be reduced by the facility to ensure safety and fairness to all residents;
 - f. A maximum of 4 people from the same household or 2 people when visitors are from different households (1 per), subject to reduction of these numbers as deemed necessary by the facility;
 - g. Allowance for visits by children if the facility deems it appropriate;
 - h. Supervision of all visits for compliance/safety;
 - i. Provision of a telephone for visits that occur through a closed window to facilitate communication;
 - j. Cleaning of surfaces;
 - k. A prohibition on singing, breath-operated musical instruments, and shouting; and
 - I. Other restrictions based on the specific type of visit.
- 5. The Order also imposes restrictions and prerequisites on Allowed Visits such as when a facility has an active outbreak, and residents with an active SARS-CoV-2 infection are not allowed visitors (unless as an Essential Visit).
- 6. The Order continues to discourage off-site travel by residents, and for Laguna Honda Hospital, a separate protective quarantine order prohibits residents from leaving the campus except for limited/healthcare reasons.
- 7. Each facility must update its written COVID-19 Plan/policies in line with the updated order.
- 8. The requirements from the current order regarding resident and staff testing is removed because there is a separate Health Officer order on that topic for all SNFs.
- 9. The new order updates the COVID-19 symptoms to reflect the current symptom lists for adults and for those younger than 18 years old.

LHH/ZSFG order:

1. LHH/ZSFG SNF visitation order (C19-01c), which is almost verbatim the same as C19-03b. One change is that LHH residents are not currently allowed to leave campus under the LHH protective quarantine order, which applies only to LHH, and the order refers to that other order re LHH residents.

ARF/RCFE order:

 RCFE/ARF visitation order (C19-09b), which again is nearly verbatim the same as C19-03b. The two main changes are that this order substitutes Community Care Licensing/CCL, which is the regulatory agency for RCFEs/ARFs, for CDPH, and it keeps the prior order's language re testing results and reporting those results to DPH.

Sneha Patil, MPH

Director, Office of Policy and Planning

San Francisco Department of Public Health

sneha.patil@sfdph.org 1415-554-2795



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES AT LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL AND
ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL HOSPITAL TO LIMIT
VISITORS AND OTHER NON-ESSENTIAL PERSONS AND TO PREPARE
WRITTEN PROTOCOLS REGARDING COVID-19, INCLUDING
RESTRICTIONS ON AND SCREENING OF VISITORS AND OTHER
PROTECTIONS FOR RESIDENTS, VISITORS, AND PERSONNEL

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ORDER)

DATE OF ORDER: September 4, 2020

Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120275, 120295, et seq.; Cal. Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); San Francisco Administrative Code §7.17(b))

Summary: On February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") declared a state of emergency to prepare for coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19"). On March 5, 2020 there was the first reported case of COVID-19 in the City. On March 16, 2020, the City and five other Bay Area counties and the City of Berkeley, working together, were the first in the State to implement shelter-in-place orders in a collective effort to reduce the impact of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. That virus is easily transmitted, especially indoors or in group settings, and the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those who are older or have underlying health conditions and known to be at high risk, but also other people, regardless of age. And a major risk remains the spread of the virus that causes COVID-19 through asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic carriers, people who can spread the disease but do not even know they are infected and contagious. The spread of disease is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm.

On March 7, 2020, the City's Health Officer issued Order No. C19-01, limiting visitors and non-essential personnel from Laguna Honda Hospital, one of the largest skilled nursing facilities in the country. On March 10, 2020, Health Officer Order No. C19-03 was issued to extend similar restrictions and other safety measures to other skilled nursing and residential facilities in the City. Order No. C19-01 was expanded on March 11, 2020, to include the skilled nursing unit at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and add the additional safety requirements. On March 18, 2020, the Health Officer issued Order No. C19-09, extending similar restrictions and protections to other



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

residential living facilities in the City. Collectively, these orders served to protect residents and staff at residential living facilities in the City.

Some residents of community living facilities are being treated for health conditions that make them particularly vulnerable to suffering the most serious complications of COVID-19, including death. Community living settings also make it easier for the virus to spread. And medical personnel and other essential staff of hospitals and residential facilities are experiencing increased stress associated with providing excellent support during this public health emergency. It is critical to protect all these populations from avoidable exposure to the disease and other pathogens. At the same time, allowing visitation in such settings is also important to the health and well-being of residents, many of whom have gone without in-person visits for almost six months. The Health Officer and the Department of Public Health ("DPH") have been reviewing the literature and data to help craft rules that will expand visitation in safer ways while also continuing to protect these populations.

Although our collective effort has had a positive impact on limiting the spread of the virus, key concerns remain. The number of infections and infection rate in the City remain high, and it is anticipated that infection rates will continue to increase as we enter the Fall (when the flu and colds could negatively impact health in these facilities) and other activities are further allowed under state and local orders. We are going to have to live with the threat of the virus for many months to come.

This Order expands visitation at the listed Residential Facilities, accomplishing the purpose of strengthening our community social distancing response, protecting medical resources and healthcare providers, and supporting the well-being of residents by allowing for in-person visits when they can be done safely. The Order gives such facilities flexibility to allow three new kinds of visitation: outdoor visits (where resident and visitor are outside), vehicle-based visits (where the visitors remain in a vehicle), and facility window visits (where the resident remains in the building behind a window or door with a window). This Order lists many requirements for allowing such visits, including mandatory screening of visitors on the day of the visit, mandatory physical distancing, wearing a face covering as required by Health Officer Order No. C19-12c, a prohibition on direct exchange of gifts or other items between the resident and visitors, a requirement that visits be scheduled in advance, restrictions on the length of visits and how many visitors are allowed, and other protections. Residential Facilities are given leeway to determine how to safely offer such visits and what kinds of visits they wish to offer, although they must contact the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") if they are unable to allow for some version of this expanded visitation.

This Order also makes other changes, cleaning up the prior requirements, adding a checklist of key visitation requirements, and requiring Residential Facilities to notify residents and authorized decision makers of these changes. This Order goes into effect at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, revises and replaces the prior version (Order No.

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

C19-01b) as of that time and date, and will remain in effect until extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer.

Table of Contents:

1.	Intent	4
2.	General Requirements	4
3.	Visitation Restrictions and Requirements	4
4.	Types of Visitation	4
5.	Allowed Visitation	5
a b c d	Facility Window Visit Requirements Vehicle Visit Requirements Outdoor Visit Requirements	
a b 7.	1	12
8.	Visitor Screening Procedures	13
9.	Other COVID-19 Related Protocols	13
10.	Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged	13
11.	Face Coverings	14
12.	Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement	14
13.	Staff Screening	15
14.	Staff and Resident Testing	
15.	COVID-19 Guidance	15
16.	Non-Compliance	15
17.	No Restriction on First Responders, Others	15
18.	Definitions	16
19.	Licensing Entity Notification	17
20.	List of Residential Facilities	17
21.	Complaints	17
22.	Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19	17
23.	Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths	17



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

24.	Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State Health Orders	. 18
	State and Local Emergency Proclamations	
	State Health Orders	
25.	Effective Date	. 18
26.	Reporting Violations.	. 19
27.	Copies and Notice	. 19
28.	Severability	. 19
29.	Interpretation	. 19

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (THE "HEALTH OFFICER") ORDERS:

- 1. <u>Intent.</u> The intent of this Order is to ensure that residents, staff, and Visitors at each long-term care residential facility listed in Section 20 below (each a "Residential Facility") are protected from the spread of COVID-19 to the greatest extent possible given how vulnerable most residents at Residential Facilities in the City are to the disease and how easy it is to transmit the SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, especially from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people. Other capitalized terms in this Order are defined throughout this Order.
- 2. General Requirements. While this Order is in effect, each Residential Facility and the staff of each such Residential Facility must comply with the visitation and COVID-19 related protocols listed by this Order as well as all other requirements of this Order. Visitors allowed under this Order must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by this Order and by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.
- 3. <u>Visitation Restrictions and Requirements</u>. Each Residential Facility and its staff must exclude from entry or access to its Premises any Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel including, but not limited to, visitors of residents at the Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order. Such Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel, including but not limited to authorized decision-makers and family members of residents, are ordered not to visit any Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order.
- 4. <u>Types of Visitation</u>. This Order restricts onsite visits between Residential Facility residents and Visitors. When Visitors seek to visit or contact a resident, the Residential Facility may allow visitation or contact only in the following ways. First, each Residential Facility must make reasonable efforts to facilitate such contact by remote means such as telephone or videoconference that do not expose



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

the resident to in-person contact. Second, each Residential Facility may authorize Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation on a case-by-case basis using the following protocols and other protocols regarding visitation it puts in place. Based on the context, a Residential Facility may refuse Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation when visits cannot occur in a manner that protects the health and welfare of the resident, the Visitor, and Residential Facility personnel. Each Residential Facility must monitor and ensure compliance with the requirements of this Order.

5. Allowed Visitation. The term "Allowed Visitation" means an in-person visit or contact that occurs between a resident and a Visitor under this Section 5. Allowed Visitation includes Facility Window Visits, Vehicle Visits, and Outdoor Visits, each as defined in this Section. Allowed Visitation, regardless of type, may only occur when the Residential Facility complies with all General Visitation Requirements listed below and also each requirement that applies to the specific type of visit. The checklist attached as Appendix A to this Order outlines most requirements for Allowed Visitation, but all requirements listed in the body of this Order must be met. Each Residential Facility should offer at least one type of Allowed Visitation except when that cannot be done safely and is encouraged to offer multiple types when staffing, resources, and the context permit doing so safely. If a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CDPH with an explanation of why it is unable to offer such visitation. Safety considerations for visits include not only COVID-19-related issues but more typical resident safety issues to ensure that risks to resident safety and well-being are minimized whenever possible.

In relation to implementation of Allowed Visitation, a Residential Facility may utilize trained volunteers to help meet the requirements of this Order so long as such volunteers, if onsite, are screened and meet other applicable requirements for staff. Examples of each type of Allowed Visitation are included below, and these are for illustration purposes and are not intended to show the only way that visitation may occur. This Order gives discretion to each Residential Facility to implement visitation in the ways that make the most sense and that protect resident, staff, and Visitor safety in the facility's unique setting.

- a. <u>General Visitation Requirements</u>. Each visit that occurs as an Allowed Visitation must comply with all of the following requirements (the "General Visitation Requirements"):
 - i. All visits are subject to the COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions listed in Section 6 below.
 - ii. The visit must be supervised by Residential Facility staff or trained, screened volunteers for the duration of the visit.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- iii. The visit must be planned in advance with the Residential Facility, and the Residential Facility may determine the visitation hours for each type of Allowed Visitation.
- iv. The Residential Facility must designate an appropriate area for the type of Allowed Visitation. If the Residential Facility does not have an area that meets all requirements a specific type of Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility must not allow that type of Allowed Visitation to occur.
- v. When a resident moves to or is transported to any area designated for Allowed Visitation, the resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for that journey. Except as listed below, a resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for the duration of the visit. Except as listed below, each Visitor must wear a Face Covering at all times. The rules regarding Face Coverings are listed below in Section 11.
- vi. The Residential Facility must provide a telephone on request to any resident who remains inside the building during a visit so that Visitors can safely communicate with the resident, such as from afar or through closed windows.
- vii. Sharing items between Visitors and residents, including gifts, flowers, reading materials, games, food, drinks, or utensils, during any visit is not allowed. A Residential Facility may adopt a protocol for allowing Visitors or others to send or deliver items or gifts to residents through Residential Facility staff so long as the protocol addresses how to ensure resident safety and minimize the risk of disease transmission through surface contact. Such a protocol may <u>not</u> allow Visitors to hand such items directly to a resident during a visit.
- viii. Except as listed below, each Visitor and Visitor group must maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing from all other groups and from all residents, including the resident they are visiting. No physical touching is allowed between a Visitor and any resident (meaning no hugging, hand-shaking, kissing, etc.). The Residential Facility must post signs outlining these rules, clearly mark spaces to prevent Visitor groups from being too close to each other or to residents, limit crowding, and increase the distance between groups as needed to ensure that people can hear each other without having to shout to be heard. Sample signs will be available online soon at https://www.sfcdcp.org/infectious-diseases-a-to-z/coronavirus-2019-novel-coronavirus/coronavirus-2019-information-for-healthcare-providers (under the "Long Term Care and Senior Care" list).



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- ix. No more than four Visitors from the same household are allowed. If visitors are from different households, the group of Visitors must be limited to two people total (one per different household). Visitation group size can be limited by the Resident Facility based on facility space or other safety considerations to allow for proper distancing.
- x. The Residential Facility must screen visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms (as defined in Section 18.e below) prior to the start of the visit as outlined in Section 7 below. For Outdoor Visits, temperature screening of each Visitor is also required.
- xi. No visitor who answers a screening question indicating they have any of the COVID-19 Symptoms or who otherwise answers questions indicating that they have recent exposure to SARS-CoV-2 is allowed to visit.
- xii. Except for Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, the Residential Facility must require Visitors to perform hand hygiene in accordance with guidelines from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and provide supplies for hand hygiene such as hand sanitizer or a sink with soap, clean water, and towels as appropriate. More information on hand hygiene is available at https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/when-how-handwashing.html and https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/hand-sanitizer-use.html.
- xiii. The Residential Facility must routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces under the control of the Residential Facility in any area used for visits.
- xiv. Each visit is limited to one hour, and a Residential Facility may impose shorter time limits if needed to accommodate residents while ensuring compliance with the requirements of this Order. A Residential Facility may also limit the number of visits per resident each week, month, or otherwise in order to ensure that all residents are able to have visitors in a fair and equitable manner and take into account the context of a given resident.
- xv. A visit may be cancelled by the Residential Facility due to relevant considerations that impact Visitor, staff, or resident safety.
- xvi. Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the interior of a Residential Facility. If visitors must travel through the interior of a Residential Facility, the facility should have them take the shortest route possible. By way of example, it is acceptable for Visitors to walk through a facility's lobby to get to an



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- outdoor garden or courtyard where Outdoor Visitation occurs (so long as travel through the building is not restricted at the time under Section 6 below).
- xvii. Shouting, singing, or playing instruments that use the human breath (such as woodwind or brass instruments) is prohibited except when everyone is behind closed windows.
- xviii. Except for Vehicle Visitation, visitation by children is left to the discretion of the Residential Facility. If children are allowed to visit, all Visitors who are two years old and older must wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Also, screening for any COVID-19 Symptoms must take into account the different list of symptoms for youths under 18 years old (see Section 18.e below).
- b. Facility Window Visit Requirements. The term "Facility Window Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) are separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident. There are two types of Facility Window Visits: a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and resident is open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors; and a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident is closed so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window: a resident in their room on the first floor with window open to a garden or walkway where the Visitors are located; a resident in part of a common area that has privacy and a window that opens out on a parking lot where the Visitors are located; and a resident in a recreation room that has a sliding glass door open to a patio that is accessible to the Visitors. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window: a resident in their room on the first floor behind a closed window talking by phone with Visitors who are outside on a walkway or in a garden; a resident in a part of the facility lobby that has large windows that do not open talking by phone with Visitors who are on the other side of the window and distant from other people entering the building; or a resident who is seated behind a door with a large window that is closed talking by phone with Visitors who are standing in a parking lot on the other side of the door.

Facility Window Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:

i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window:



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
- 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors.
- 3. The resident must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
- 4. Each Visitor must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
- ii. For Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
 - 2. All windows and doors separating the Visitor(s) and the resident are closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window.
 - 3. Each Visitor is <u>not</u> required to maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing the resident they are visiting because the windows and doors are closed.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- c. Vehicle Visit Requirements. The term "Vehicle Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) remain in a vehicle and the resident is at least six feet away from the vehicle. There are two types of Vehicle Visits: a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows, which is when any windows separating the Visitor(s) and resident are open; and a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows, which is when the resident is behind a closed window in the Residential Facility so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows: a resident in a wheelchair is positioned on a walkway near a parked car talking through open car windows with Visitors who are seated in the car; and a resident sitting outside on the patio of their room talking with Visitors through open car windows of a car parked nearby. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows: a resident standing at a window that does not open in the building lobby talking by phone with Visitors parked just outside in the parking lot; and a resident sitting at a closed window in their room talking by phone with Visitors parked on the street outside the window.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

Vehicle Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:

- i. For Vehicle Visits with Open Windows:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be at least six feet away from any open window in the vehicle. The resident may be outdoors or indoors at the Residential Facility.
 - 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the vehicle remains outdoors.
 - 3. If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least six feet between residents and at least six feet between vehicles.
 - 4. To reduce air flow to the resident from the vehicle, the vehicle window that is closest to the resident should remain closed, if possible.
- ii. For Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows (which is similar to a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window):
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be indoors at the Residential Facility and at least six feet away from the vehicle.
 - 2. The Residential Facility windows separating the Visitor(s) and the resident must be closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The vehicle windows may be open or closed.
 - 3. If the vehicle is parked or stopped in an area were other people will be passing, each Visitor in the vehicle must wear a Face Covering. If the vehicle windows remain closed at all times, a Face Covering is not required for Visitors in the vehicle.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- d. Outdoor Visit Requirements. The term "Outdoor Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) and the resident are all in an outdoor setting. The following are examples of an Outdoor Visit: a resident who is brought to a garden in front of the facility where lines are marked to help keep them at least six feet away from Visitors who are outside in the same garden; a resident who is



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

sitting in their wheelchair on a sidewalk where the resident is ten feet away from Visitors who are also on the sidewalk and behind an optional Plexiglas barrier that the facility has put up to help protect the resident; a resident who is seated in an interior courtyard that is open to the air where the Visitor is brought through the building lobby and then directed to remain at least six feet away during the outdoor visit; and a resident who is in the parking lot under a canopy tent that only has one wall for protection from the sun or other weather where the Visitor is also under the canopy at least six feet distant.

Outdoor Visits may only occur when all listed requirements are met. Those requirements are:

- i. The visit must occur outdoors. If the weather does not permit the Outdoor Visit to occur, the Residential Facility may postpone or cancel the visit or provide one of the other forms of visitation allowed by this Order in line with all listed requirements.
- ii. In addition to symptom screening and asking other screening questions of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit as required in Section 7 below, a Residential Facility must conduct temperature screening of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit.
- iii. If a Residential Facility uses a tent or other temporary structure in relation to an Outdoor Visit, the Residential Facility must follow the requirements of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h, including as that order is revised in the future. That order currently notes that operations under a tent, canopy, or other sun or weather shelter may occur only as long as no more than one side is of the structure is closed, allowing sufficient outdoor air movement.
- 6. COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions. For Allowed Visitation, there are certain prerequisites that apply to different kinds of visits, and if there is a COVID-19 outbreak at the Residential Facility, there are certain visitation restrictions that apply until the outbreak is resolved. Note that any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact the Department of Public Health Outbreak Management Group ("OMG") for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6. OMG may be reached by phone by calling 415-554-2830, selecting Option 1, and then following the prompts for Senior Care Facilities.
 - a. <u>Prerequisites</u>. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits:



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- i. No visit is allowed for any resident who has any of the COVID-19 Symptoms, is in isolation or quarantine related to COVID-19, or has a COVID-19 diagnosis; and
- ii. There must be an absence of new COVID-19 cases or SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Residential Facility for the preceding 14 days (including residents and staff) and the Residential Facility must not be in the surveillance period for an active outbreak.

If these prerequisites are not met, then the types of visits listed in this subsection a. may not occur until the prerequisites are met.

As noted above, any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact OMG for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6.

- b. <u>Visit-Related Outbreak Restrictions</u>. If there is reason to believe that the Residential Facility has had a new COVID-19 case or SARS-CoV-2 infection, the following restrictions apply:
 - i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits, Allowed Visitation must be postponed until the requirements of Section 6.a above are met. Residential Facilities with multiple units or floors may contact OMG to determine if the Residential Facility can safely cohort to allow visitation for residents in non-outbreak units.
 - ii. For Facility Window Visits with a Closed Window and Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, visitation may continue but each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.

Any Residential Facility that has questions about what constitutes an outbreak or other questions about this section may contact OMG.

7. Necessary Visitation. The term "Necessary Visitation" means a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait and that needs to occur in addition to Allowed Visitation. If the needs and context of a particular request for Necessary Visitation justifies visitation in a manner other than Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility Administrator may arrange for Necessary Visitation of a resident. For purposes of this Order, the Residential Facility Administrator may act through a designee. The decision about whether the needs and context justify Necessary Visitation is left to the determination of the Residential Facility Administrator, who must make the decision based on this Order



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

and the COVID-19 Guidance. Also, any Necessary Visitation allowed under this Section must be done subject to requirements of the COVID-19 Guidance and as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Residential Facility. All Visitors allowed under this Section 6 must comply with subsections v, vii, x, xii, xiii, and xvii of the General Visitation Requirements above.

- 8. Visitor Screening Procedures. Each Residential Facility must use the following screening procedures for all Visitors. The Residential Facility must screen each Visitor on the day of the visit before the visit in a manner consistent with current DPH guidance (which takes into account guidance from CDPH and the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC")) regarding screening. At a minimum, the screening must address current or recent: actual or suspected COVID-19 diagnosis; actual or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection; actual or suspected close contact with someone with the virus; and COVID-19 Symptoms (listed below in Section 18.e) consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection, taking into account the age of the person being screened given different criteria for people under 18 years old. If a Visitor answers affirmatively to any screening question, they should, if appropriate, be referred for testing and directed to the DPH website with information about Health Officer directives on isolation and quarantine and explanatory material in multiple languages, available online at https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19. Screening may be done by phone, verbally in person ensuring at least six feet of physical distance, or using other methods such as text or email. It is up to the Residential Facility, at the discretion of the Administrator or designee, to decide which method(s) for screening work best for the context. A Residential Facility may use temperature checks consistent with DPH guidelines, and it must conduct temperature checks for Outdoor Visitation.
- 9. Other COVID-19 Related Protocols. The following sections list additional COVID-19 related protocols aimed at protecting residents, staff, and Visitors.
- 10. Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged. The Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital 4A Unit (one Residential Facility listed below) must discourage Non-Essential Resident Movement, as defined in Section 18.c below, onto and off of Residential Facility Premises where feasible. Whenever a Residential Facility resident from that facility leaves the Residential Facility Premises, the resident is ordered to comply with Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.o of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. At the time this Order was issued, the Social Distancing Requirements are:
 - a. Maintaining at least six-foot social distancing from individuals who are not part of the same Household;
 - b. Frequently washing hands with soap and water for at least 20 seconds, or using hand sanitizer that is recognized by the Centers for Disease Control



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

and Prevention as effective in combatting COVID-19;

- c. Covering coughs and sneezes with a tissue or fabric or, if not possible, into the sleeve or elbow (but not into hands);
- d. Wearing a face covering when out in public, consistent with the orders or guidance of the Health Officer; and
- e. Avoiding all social interaction outside the Household when sick with a fever, cough, or other COVID-19 symptoms.

For Laguna Honda Hospital, it is subject to Health Officer Order No. C19-11 in relation to the subject matter of this Section 10, and for Laguna Honda Hospital, Order No. C19-11 controls on this subject.

- 11. Face Coverings. In general, all residents, staff, and Visitors must comply with Order No. C19-12c of the Health Officer, issued on July 22, 2020 (the "Face Covering Order"), including as that order is revised in the future. Residents, staff, and Visitors must also comply with any other requirements of the Residential Facility regarding wearing a mask or Face Covering or other Personal Protective Equipment ("PPE"). In addition to the exceptions to wearing a Face Covering listed in the Face Covering Order, a Face Covering is not required for any resident who, on account of dementia, grave mental illness, fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove a Face Covering, inability to call for help, physician order, or other circumstance should not wear a Face Covering. The Residential Facility must provide a Face Covering or other mask to any resident or Visitor on request. The Face Covering Order and this Order allow Residential Facilities to require and provide coverings that offer added protection such as an isolation mask or personal protective equipment ("PPE"), as appropriate in the circumstances.
- 12. Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement. Each Residential Facility must update and continue to implement the written plan that was originally required by the prior version of this Order (the "COVID-19 Plan"). This Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has written policies or other written guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan. The Residential Facility's existing COVID-19 Plan may be used while a new version is prepared, and the COVID-19 Plan should be updated no later than September 15, 2020. The plan must comply with applicable guidance from the DPH regarding the screening of patients, personnel, and visitors for signs of COVID-19 or other illnesses. The COVID-19 Plan must also address other applicable COVID-19-related guidance, including steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission by authorized Visitors and Non-Essential Persons such as through hand washing, use of Face Coverings, imposition of the Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.0 of the Stay-Safe-At-Home Order, and limiting the duration of visits, as



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

appropriate. Nothing in this Order prohibits a Residential Facility from taking steps more protective against transmission of COVID-19 than guidance provided by the CDC, CDPH, and DPH in its plan. Each Residential Facility must update its COVID-19 Plan when appropriate under new COVID-19 recommendations or requirements issued by DPH or as otherwise required by law. See the COVID-19 Guidance (discussed in Section 15 below) for more information about the COVID-19 Plan.

- 13. <u>Staff Screening</u>. Each Residential Facility's COIVD-19 Plan must also include a requirement that any employee or other staff member who is sick or does not pass the required screening must be immediately sent home and not return to work until they can do so safely under DPH guidance or authorized to return by a physician. If a Residential Facility is unable to immediately send home any such employee or staff member, the Residential Facility must (1) prevent that staff member from engaging in any resident care or contact and (2) immediately notify its respective licensing entity and seek guidance from that entity.
- 14. <u>Staff and Resident Testing</u>. On May 7, 2020, the Health Officer issued Order No. C19-13 regarding testing and infection control practices at congregate living facilities in the City, including each Residential Facility. Each Residential Facility is required to continue to comply with that order.
- 15. <u>COVID-19 Guidance</u>. Attached to this Order as <u>Appendix B</u> is written guidance to Residential Facilities ("COVID-19 Guidance") issued by the Health Officer. The Health Officer or designee may revise the COVID-19 Guidance in writing from time to time. Each Residential Facility must follow the COVID-19 Guidance.
- 16. Non-Compliance. If any Visitor or Non-Essential Person refuses to comply with this Order, then the Residential Facility may contact the San Francisco Sheriff Department to request assistance in enforcing this Order. The Residential Facility shall take whatever steps are possible within the bounds of the law to protect residents from any such Visitor or person who refuses to comply with this Order. For example, a Residential Facility should contact facility security and ask the unauthorized visitor or person to comply with conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility. Even if a Visitor or Non-Essential Person otherwise complies with the facility's visitation protocols as outlined in this paragraph, they are still in violation of this Order if their presence is not an Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation under this Order.
- 17. No Restriction on First Responders, Others. This Order does not restrict first responder access to Residential Facility Premises during an emergency. Further, this Order does not restrict state or federal officers, investigators, or medical or law enforcement personnel from carrying out their lawful duties on Residential Facility Premises. Persons other than first responders allowed access under this paragraph



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Residential Facility Premises when feasible.

- 18. <u>Definitions</u>: For the purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below:
 - a. "Visitors" are people who come onsite to a Residential Facility to meet with a resident who are not staff of the facility. This term includes family members and loved ones of residents and those who have legal authority to make healthcare or other legal decisions for a resident. The Ombudsperson is an authorized visitor and is <u>not</u> included in this term, but the Ombudsperson must still follow all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility and should also try to avoid non-essential visits.
 - b. "Non-Essential Personnel" are employees, contractors, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. Refer to the COVID-19 Guidance for more information.
 - c. "Non-Essential Resident Movement" means travel off or onto Residential Facility Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes as described more fully in the COVID-19 Guidance.
 - d. "Premises" includes without limitation the buildings, grounds, facilities, driveways, parking areas, and public spaces within the legal boundaries of each Residential Facility listed in Section 20 below.
 - e. "COVID-19 Symptom" means a symptom consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection. At the time this Order is issued, that list includes for individuals 18 years or older any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); cough; sore throat; shortness of breath; chills; headache; body aches; fatigue; loss of smell or taste; diarrhea; runny nose; nasal congestion; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19. For those younger than 18 years, "COVID-19 Symptom" means any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); sore throat; new uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline); diarrhea, vomiting, or abdominal pain; new onset of severe headache, especially with a fever; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- 19. <u>Licensing Entity Notification</u>. Each Residential Facility must within 12 hours of receipt of this Order notify its respective licensing entity (whether the California Department of Public Health or otherwise) of the existence of this Order regarding the Residential Facility. And as noted in Section 5 above, if a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CDPH with an explanation of why it is unable to offer such visitation.
- 20. <u>List of Residential Facilities</u>. This Order applies to each facility listed below (each a Residential Facility):

Residential Facility Name	Street Address	ZIP
San Francisco General Hospital D/P SNF	1001	94110
	POTRERO	
	AVE	
Laguna Honda Hospital & Rehabilitation Ctr D/P	375 LAGUNA	94116
SNF	HONDA BLVD	

- 21. Complaints. A Residential Facility resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative may contact a representative of the Residential Facility to seek clarification of any part of this Order by contacting the Administrator of the facility. If a resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative objects to the appropriateness of the limitation of access contained in this Order, the resident or lawful authorized representative must first raise their concern with the Residential Facility at issue. The Residential Facility is ordered to respond to the concern within 2 business days.
- 22. Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19. This Order is issued based on the need for continued protection of all Residential Facility Visitors, residents, and staff in the City. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Residents at Residential Facilities are among the most vulnerable and most likely to face serious outcomes, including death, from infection by SARS-CoV-2. There are currently only limited treatments and not approved vaccine for COVID-19, and there is a high risk of infection from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people who have the virus. Due to the length of time during which people with the virus can unknowingly infect others, it is imperative that all appropriate steps be taken to protect residents and staff who deal with residents from infection. Limiting visitors and requiring the other safety protections included in this Order will thereby slow virus transmission as much as possible in order to protect the most vulnerable, prevent infections and serious illness and death, and prevent the healthcare system from being overwhelmed.
- 23. <u>Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths</u>. As of September 1, 2020, there are 9,755 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the City (up from 37 on March 16, 2020, the day



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

before the first shelter-in-place order in the City went into effect) as well as at least 84 deaths (up from 1 death on March 17, 2020). This information, as well as information regarding hospitalizations and hospital capacity, is regularly updated on the San Francisco Department of Public Health's website at https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/fjki-2fab.

24. <u>Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State Health</u> Orders.

- a. State and Local Emergency Proclamations. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency issued by Mayor London Breed, as supplemented on March 11, 2020, the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health, as each of them have been and may be supplemented.
- b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the March 19, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer (the "State Shelter Order"), which set baseline statewide restrictions on non-residential Business activities, effective until further notice, the Governor's March 19, 2020 Executive Order N-33-20 directing California residents to follow the State Shelter Order, and the July 13, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer. The May 4, 2020 Executive Order issued by Governor Newsom and May 7, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer permit certain Businesses to reopen if a local health officer believes the conditions in that jurisdictions warrant it, but expressly acknowledge the authority of local health officers to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer. Also on June 18, 2020, the State Department of Public Health issued guidance for the use of face coverings, requiring all people in the State to wear face coverings in certain high-risk situations, subject to limited exceptions.
- 25. <u>Effective Date</u>. This Order becomes effective at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Effective as of 9 a.m. on September 5, 2020, this Order revises and replaces Health Officer Order No. C19-01b, issued March 11, 2020.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-01c

- 26. <u>Reporting Violations</u>. Any person who believes this Order is being violated may contact 3-1-1 or go to www.sf.gov/report-health-order-violation to provide information about the alleged violation.
- 27. Copies and Notice. Each Residential Facility must promptly provide notice of this Order as follows: (1) by posting this Order on the Residential Facility website (if any); (2) by posting this Order at all entrances to the Residential Facility; (3) by providing a summary of this Order to each Residential Facility resident, indicating how the resident can obtain a full copy; (4) by providing a summary of this Order to any authorized decision maker for each Residential Facility resident if not the resident, including any conservator, indicating how the decision maker can obtain a full copy; (5) by providing this Order to the Residential Facility Ombudsperson (if any); and (6) by giving a copy to anyone who visits the Residential Facility or who contacts the Residential Facility seeking to visit.

The City must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the Department of Public Health website at www.sfdph.org/healthorders; (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

- 28. <u>Severability</u>. If any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other people or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.
- 29. <u>Interpretation</u>. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the intent of this Order as described in Section 1 above. The summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order; in the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Tomás J. Aragón, MD. DrPH,

Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco

Date: September 4, 2020

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

Note: This document provides a summary for convenience of the requirements for Allowed Visitation under Section 5 of the Order. Each Residential Facility must comply with all requirements of the Order, regardless of what is listed below.

FACILITY VISITATION PREREQUISITES		
VISITATION TYPE	PREREQUISITES	
Outdoor Visits	1.No visitation for residents with symptoms, in isolation or COVID+ and quarantine	
Facility Window Visits with an Open Window	2. Absence of any new COVID-19 cases in the facility for 14 days, either	
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows	residents or staff, AND not currently in the surveillance period for an active outbreak	
Facility Window Visit with a Closed		
Window /	Visitor(s) do not walk through the facility	
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows	(Note that items 1. and 2. above do not apply for closed-window visits)	

In the event of a new COVID-19 case at the facility, take the following actions until the following visitation prerequisites are met:		
VISITATION TYPE	ACTION	
Outdoor Visits	Suspend/Postpone	
Facility Window Visits with an Open Window	For facilities with multiple units/floors, contact the DPH / OMG¹ to determine if the facility can safely cohort to allow visitation for residents in non-outbreak units.	
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows		
Facility Window Visit with a Closed		
Window /	Allow as long as the visitor(s) do not walk through the facility	
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility	Allow as long as the visitor(s) do not walk through the facility	
Windows		

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Outdoor Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS	
Outdoor Visits	☐ Visits must be supervised by facility staff at all times.	
	Visitation in outdoor settings only.	
Definition: Visitor and	 If weather does not permit, provide window or vehicle visits. 	
Resident are both in an	Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours.	
outdoor setting	 Visitor(s) must wear masks. Residents must wear masks or other face coverings (as tolerated).² 	
	6-feet or more physical distancing (no physical touching between resident and visitor such as hugging, hand-shaking, etc.) It is the facility's responsibility to monitor and ensure compliance. It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(s) groups from being too close to each other.	
	No more than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are from different households, the group should be limited to 2 visitors. Visitation group size can be determined based on facility space to allow for proper distancing and safety.	
	☐ Visitation by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If children are allowed to visit, all visitors ages 2+ should wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Screening should take into account age-specific symptoms.	
	 Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues <u>and</u> conduct temperature check prior to visit. 	
	Perform hand hygiene in accordance with CDC guidelines (provide supplies as needed).	
	Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.	
	Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.	
	Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules.	
	☐ Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the facility or walking the shortest route through the facility.	

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Facility Window Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS		
For All window visits:		st be supervised by facility staff at all times	
		st be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours. than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are from different	
		ds, the group should be limited to 2 visitors. Visitation group size can be	
		ed based on facility space to allow for proper distancing and safety.	
		sitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit.	
	Facility sh	nould have a phone available to speak to resident at a safe distance.	
	☐ If the res	dent must be taken to any of the designated areas, the resident must	
	wear a m	ask (as tolerated) ² for that journey.	
	☐ Wheneve	r possible, visitation should take place without visitor(s) walking through	
	the facilit	y or walking the shortest route through the facility.	
	Sharing it	ems, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is not	
		d. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by	
	•	aff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection	
		ization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.	
	-	st not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate	
		while assuring compliance with visitation rules.	
		by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If children are allowed	
		Il visitors ages 2+ should wear a face covering, and children must be under	
		on at all times. Screening should take into account age-specific symptoms.	
Facility Window Visits		must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask (as	
with an Open Window	tolerated	•	
Definition of the		must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask.	
Definition : Visitor and Resident are separated by	•	nould ensure that visitors seeing different residents can also keep at least 6 t (limit crowding) and farther if needed so people can hear without	
and open window with the	•	It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(s)	
Resident on the Facility side of a window and Visitor(s)	_	om being too close to each other.	
outside on the other side			
Facility Window Visit	☐ If the visi	tor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the visitor(s) must	
with a Closed Window	wear mas	sks.	
Definition : Visitor and			
Resident are separated by a			
Window. At all times, the			
facility window must remain closed so no air flow is			
exchanged			

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Vehicle Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS
For All Vehicle Visits:	 □ Visits to be supervised by facility staff at all times. □ Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours. □ Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit. □ Facility should have a phone available to speak to resident at a safe distance.
	If the resident must be taken to any of the designated areas, the resident must wear a mask (as tolerated)* for that journey.
	Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.
	Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.
	Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate
	residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules.
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows	Resident should stay at least 6 feet back from the vehicle window and wear a mask (as tolerated). ²
Definition: Visitor(s), in a vehicle, and Resident are separated by at least 6 feet of distance where the	 Visitor(s) must wear a mask. If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least 6 feet between residents. To reduce air flow to the resident, if possible, keep vehicle's window closest to the
Resident is in either an outdoor space or in the Facility behind an open window	resident closed.
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows	☐ If the visitor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the visitor(s) must wear masks in the vehicle.
Definition: Visitor(s), in a vehicle, and Resident are separated by a Closed Facility Window. At all times, the facility window must remain closed so no air flow is exchanged.	

¹ Contact DPH Outbreak Management Group (OMG) with any specific questions for their sites and guidance. Call 415-554-2830, select Option 1, and then follow the prompts for Senior Care Facilities. See Section 6 of the Order for details.

² Requirements for masks or face coverings are relaxed for residents as follows and for related/similar issues: a diagnosis of dementia or grave mental illness; fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove or call for help <u>OR</u> ordered by physician. See Section 11 of the Order for details.



<u>APPENDIX B</u>: WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-01c

DATE ORDER ISSUED: September 4, 2020

This information (the "COVID-19 Guidance") is meant to help each Residential Facility when implementing the Order to which it is attached. This document uses the terms defined in the Order.

- 1. For purposes of the Order, the term "Administrator" means the administrator of a Residential Facility or the administrator's designee.
- 2. The Order does not prohibit a Residential Facility from being more restrictive in its operations and practices than is outlined in the Order. The Order also does not require allowing visitation when not otherwise required by applicable laws or regulations.
- 3. Guidance regarding Section 12 (the COVID-19 Plan): The Order requires the Residential Facility to create a COVID-19 Plan that addresses issues including: 1) screening of residents, staff, and Visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms or other illness; 2) conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises for authorized visitors that reduce the risk of infection, such as thorough hand washing, appropriate use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), maintaining at least six feet distance from other people, and limiting the duration of visits, as appropriate; 3) sending sick employees home immediately; 4) notifying DPH and other regulators of any positive SARS-CoV-2 result for a resident or staff member, including as required by law; and 5) other CDC or CDPH requirements. Note that the Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has policies or other guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan.

The COVID-19 Plan should also address how the facility can reduce the risk of unnecessary exposure as outlined in the San Francisco Department of Public Health Social Distancing Protocol, attached as Appendix A to Health Officer Order No. C19-07h (or as that order is revised in the future). For example, the facility should avoid large inperson gatherings of residents or staff, instead holding smaller gatherings that still meet the facility's mission and needs (*e.g.*, substituting unit-based activities for a facility-wide bingo event). Similarly, postponing large staff meetings or having meetings occur by phone can help when feasible.

Additionally, there may be areas that warrant limitations that are not normally in place. A Residential Facility may have a cafeteria or other concession that is normally available to residents, essential employees, other employees (such as others who share the building but are not associated with the healthcare mission of the facility), and Visitors. While this Order is in effect, the Residential Facility should consider whether a restriction on such use makes sense. One option might be to limit cafeteria visits to residents and essential staff and temporarily block other employees and Visitors from that area.



WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-01c

If the facility had plans to have vendors come onsite for meetings or to show sample products, those meetings should be conducted via remote communication, occur at another site that does not include a vulnerable population, or be postponed until after this emergency situation if possible.

- 4. Guidance regarding Section 4 (efforts to facilitate contact that is not in-person): The Order requires the Residential Facility to make reasonable efforts to facilitate contact that is not in person between a Visitor or Non-Essential Personnel and a resident. Such efforts include using technology to facilitate a remote connection with the resident when possible and would include telephone calls, telephone conferences involving multiple people, and video conferences using appropriate technology. Efforts are not reasonable if they interfere with the Residential Facility's healthcare mission or if they are not available or are cost prohibitive. The Residential Facility is encouraged to be creative in trying to facilitate contact that is not in-person so long as it complies with its other legal and regulatory obligations.
- 5. Guidance regarding Section 7 (Necessary Visitation): The term Necessary Visitation refers to a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait until later. Nothing in the Order limits the standard healthcare that the Residential Facility provides to a resident. When medical care is appropriate or required, it is by definition permitted under the Order. Necessary Visitation refers to other types of visits or contact that are time-sensitive or critical. For example, a resident may be in the end stages of life. In that instance, family or loved ones should be allowed to be with the resident unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission in light of the current emergency, such as during a serious outbreak of cases. Another example would be a resident who is updating their will or other legal papers and an in-person meeting with the lawyer or family members or a notary is required, again unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission. But, a meeting with a lawyer to discuss future changes or other, non-urgent issues should generally be postponed or conducted via telephone or other means.

Anyone who is legally authorized to make decisions for the resident, whether by operation of a durable power of attorney or public or private conservatorship, must be given special consideration, especially if they need to meet in person with the resident to fulfill their role. This distinction is in place because decisions regarding care when there is a surrogate decision maker should not be delayed when in-person contact is needed, whereas visits by other family or loved ones are important but may not be time-sensitive. But such authorized decision-makers should be encouraged to use alternative methods of contacting the resident when possible in order to avoid exposing the resident and others.

Also, Necessary Visitation should <u>not</u> be granted for routine visits by decision makers, family, or loved ones, even if the resident very much looks forward to the visit or the visitor has a strong desire for the visit. Such routine visits put all residents at risk at this

WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-01c

time and may only occur as Allowed Visitation. But if a family member or loved one plays an essential role in providing care to a resident, without which the resident will suffer medical or clinical harm, Necessary Visitation may be appropriate.

There may be other unique situations that justify a Necessary Visitation based on the context. And as the situation evolves, the Residential Facility may need to restrict Necessary Visitation. This Order is intended to give the Administrator flexibility in making that determination so long as the decision is in line with the Order and this COVID-19 Guidance. The Administrator should not authorize Necessary Visitation for all or a majority of residents as that would likely reflect a violation of the intent of the Order to protect all residents from the risks of non-essential exposure to COVID-19.

All visits allowed as Necessary Visitation must occur subject to all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.

- 6. Guidance regarding Sections 3 and 18.b (Non-Essential Personnel): The Order defines Non-Essential Personnel as employees, contractors, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. This term also includes employees of the Residential Facility or its vendors (and their employees) who are not needed in the short term for the facility to perform its healthcare mission. For example, a vendor that makes deliveries of large bottled water refill jugs is likely not essential. However, the facility should work to see if there are ways to permit delivery, such as on a loading dock, which would eliminate the need in the short term for someone to make visits all across the facility. This Order grants the Administrator authority to make judgment calls about how best to ensure the facility is able to operate during this emergency situation.
- 7. Guidance regarding Section 18.c (Non-Essential Resident Movement): The Order defines Non-Essential Resident Movement as travel off or onto Residential Facility Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes. This is contrasted with situations when a resident leaves the facility for health-related purposes or as required by law, such as for a meeting or service mandated by a court. The goal of the Order is to encourage residents to limit Non-Essential Resident Movement.

* * *

Dated: September 4, 2020



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES TO LIMIT VISITORS AND OTHER NONESSENTIAL PERSONS AND TO PREPARE WRITTEN PROTOCOLS
REGARDING COVID-19, INCLUDING RESTRICTIONS ON AND
SCREENING OF VISITORS AND OTHER PROTECTIONS FOR
RESIDENTS, VISITORS, AND PERSONNEL

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ORDER)

DATE OF ORDER: September 4, 2020

Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120275, 120295, et seq.; Cal. Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); San Francisco Administrative Code §7.17(b))

Summary: On February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") declared a state of emergency to prepare for coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19"). On March 5, 2020 there was the first reported case of COVID-19 in the City. On March 16, 2020, the City and five other Bay Area counties and the City of Berkeley, working together, were the first in the State to implement shelter-in-place orders in a collective effort to reduce the impact of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. That virus is easily transmitted, especially indoors or in group settings, and the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those who are older or have underlying health conditions and known to be at high risk, but also other people, regardless of age. And a major risk remains the spread of the virus that causes COVID-19 through asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic carriers, people who can spread the disease but do not even know they are infected and contagious. The spread of disease is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm.

On March 7, 2020, the City's Health Officer issued Order No. C19-01, limiting visitors and non-essential personnel from Laguna Honda Hospital,



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

one of the largest skilled nursing facilities in the country. On March 10, 2020, the first version of this Order,

C19-03, was issued to extend similar restrictions and other safety measures to other skilled nursing and residential facilities in the City. Order No. C19-01 was expanded on March 11, 2020, to include the skilled nursing unit at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and add the additional safety requirements. On March 18, 2020, the Health Officer issued Order No. C19-09, extending similar restrictions and protections to other residential living facilities in the City. Collectively, these orders served to protect residents and staff at residential living facilities in the City.

Some residents of community living facilities are being treated for health conditions that make them particularly vulnerable to suffering the most serious complications of COVID-19, including death. Community living settings also make it easier for the virus to spread. And medical personnel and other essential staff of hospitals and residential facilities are experiencing increased stress associated with providing excellent support during this public health emergency. It is critical to protect all these populations from avoidable exposure to the disease and other pathogens. At the same time, allowing visitation in such settings is also important to the health and well-being of residents, many of whom have gone without inperson visits for almost six months. The Health Officer and the Department of Public Health ("DPH") have been reviewing the literature and data to help craft rules that will expand visitation in safer ways while also continuing to protect these populations.

Although our collective effort has had a positive impact on limiting the spread of the virus, key concerns remain. The number of infections and infection rate in the City remain high, and it is anticipated that infection rates will continue to increase as we enter the Fall (when the flu and colds could negatively impact health in these facilities) and other activities are further allowed under state and local orders. We are going to have to live with the threat of the virus for many months to come.

This Order expands visitation at Residential Facilities, accomplishing the purpose of strengthening our community social distancing response, protecting medical resources and healthcare providers, and supporting the well-being of residents by allowing for in-person visits when they can be done safely. The Order gives such facilities flexibility to allow three new



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

kinds of visitation: outdoor visits (where resident and visitor are outside), vehicle-based visits (where the visitors remain in a vehicle), and facility window visits (where the resident remains in the building behind a window or door with a window). This Order lists many requirements for allowing such visits, including mandatory screening of visitors on the day of the visit, mandatory physical distancing, wearing a face covering as required by Health Officer Order No. C19-12c, a prohibition on direct exchange of gifts or other items between the resident and visitors, a requirement that visits be scheduled in advance, restrictions on the length of visits and how many visitors are allowed, and other protections. Residential Facilities are given leeway to determine how to safely offer such visits and what kinds of visits they wish to offer, although they must contact the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") if they are unable to allow for some version of this expanded visitation.

This Order also makes other changes, cleaning up the prior requirements, adding a checklist of key visitation requirements, and requiring Residential Facilities to notify residents and authorized decision makers of these changes. This Order goes into effect at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, revises and replaces the prior version (Order No. C19-03) as of that time and date, and will remain in effect until extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer.

Table of Contents:

1.	Intent	5
2.	General Requirements	5
3.	Visitation Restrictions and Requirements	5
4.	Types of Visitation	5
5.	Allowed Visitation	6
8	a. General Visitation Requirements	7
	b. Facility Window Visit Requirements	
(c. Vehicle Visit Requirements	11
(d. Outdoor Visit Requirements	13
6.	COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions	14



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

a.	Prerequisites	14
b.	Visit-Related Outbreak Restrictions	15
7.	Necessary Visitation	16
8.	Visitor Screening Procedures	16
9.	Other COVID-19 Related Protocols	17
10.	Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged	17
11.	Face Coverings	17
12.	Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement	18
13.	Staff Screening	19
14.	Staff and Resident Testing	19
15.	COVID-19 Guidance	19
16.	Non-Compliance	19
17.	No Restriction on First Responders, Others	20
18.	Definitions	20
19.	Licensing Entity Notification	21
20.	List of Residential Facilities	21
21.	Complaints	22
22.	Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19	23
23.	Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths	23
24. Ord	Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State	
a. b.	8 3	
25.	Effective Date	24
26.	Reporting Violations.	24
27.	Copies and Notice	25
28.	Severability	25
29.	Interpretation	25



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (THE "HEALTH OFFICER") ORDERS:

- 1. <u>Intent</u>. The intent of this Order is to ensure that residents, staff, and Visitors at each long-term care residential facility listed in Section 20 below (each a "Residential Facility") are protected from the spread of COVID-19 to the greatest extent possible given how vulnerable most residents at Residential Facilities in the City are to the disease and how easy it is to transmit the SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, especially from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people. Other capitalized terms in this Order are defined throughout this Order.
- 2. General Requirements. While this Order is in effect, each Residential Facility and the staff of each such Residential Facility must comply with the visitation and COVID-19 related protocols listed by this Order as well as all other requirements of this Order. Visitors allowed under this Order must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by this Order and by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.
- 3. <u>Visitation Restrictions and Requirements</u>. Each Residential Facility and its staff must exclude from entry or access to its Premises any Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel including, but not limited to, visitors of residents at the Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order. Such Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel, including but not limited to authorized decision-makers and family members of residents, are ordered not to visit any Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order.
- 4. Types of Visitation. This Order restricts onsite visits between Residential Facility residents and Visitors. When Visitors seek to visit or contact a resident, the Residential Facility may allow visitation or contact only in the following ways. First, each Residential Facility must make reasonable efforts to facilitate such contact by remote means such as telephone or videoconference that do not expose the resident to inperson contact. Second, each Residential Facility may authorize



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation on a case-by-case basis using the following protocols and other protocols regarding visitation it puts in place. Based on the context, a Residential Facility may refuse Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation when visits cannot occur in a manner that protects the health and welfare of the resident, the Visitor, and Residential Facility personnel. Each Residential Facility must monitor and ensure compliance with the requirements of this Order.

5. Allowed Visitation. The term "Allowed Visitation" means an in-person visit or contact that occurs between a resident and a Visitor under this Section 5. Allowed Visitation includes Facility Window Visits, Vehicle Visits, and Outdoor Visits, each as defined in this Section. Allowed Visitation, regardless of type, may only occur when the Residential Facility complies with all General Visitation Requirements listed below and also each requirement that applies to the specific type of visit. The checklist attached as Appendix A to this Order outlines most requirements for Allowed Visitation, but all requirements listed in the body of this Order must be met. Each Residential Facility should offer at least one type of Allowed Visitation except when that cannot be done safely and is encouraged to offer multiple types when staffing, resources, and the context permit doing so safely. If a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CDPH with an explanation of why it is unable to offer such visitation. Safety considerations for visits include not only COVID-19-related issues but more typical resident safety issues to ensure that risks to resident safety and well-being are minimized whenever possible.

In relation to implementation of Allowed Visitation, a Residential Facility may utilize trained volunteers to help meet the requirements of this Order so long as such volunteers, if onsite, are screened and meet other applicable requirements for staff. Examples of each type of Allowed Visitation are included below, and these are for illustration purposes and are not intended to show the only way that visitation may occur. This Order gives discretion to each Residential Facility to implement visitation in the ways that make the most sense and that protect resident, staff, and Visitor safety in the facility's unique setting.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- a. <u>General Visitation Requirements</u>. Each visit that occurs as an Allowed Visitation must comply with all of the following requirements (the "General Visitation Requirements"):
 - i. All visits are subject to the COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions listed in Section 6 below.
 - ii. The visit must be supervised by Residential Facility staff or trained, screened volunteers for the duration of the visit.
 - iii. The visit must be planned in advance with the Residential Facility, and the Residential Facility may determine the visitation hours for each type of Allowed Visitation.
 - iv. The Residential Facility must designate an appropriate area for the type of Allowed Visitation. If the Residential Facility does not have an area that meets all requirements a specific type of Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility must not allow that type of Allowed Visitation to occur.
 - v. When a resident moves to or is transported to any area designated for Allowed Visitation, the resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for that journey. Except as listed below, a resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for the duration of the visit. Except as listed below, each Visitor must wear a Face Covering at all times. The rules regarding Face Coverings are listed below in Section 11.
 - vi. The Residential Facility must provide a telephone on request to any resident who remains inside the building during a visit so that Visitors can safely communicate with the resident, such as from afar or through closed windows.
 - vii. Sharing items between Visitors and residents, including gifts, flowers, reading materials, games, food, drinks, or utensils, during any visit is not allowed. A Residential Facility may adopt a protocol for allowing Visitors or others to send or deliver items or gifts to residents through



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Residential Facility staff so long as the protocol addresses how to ensure resident safety and minimize the risk of disease transmission through surface contact. Such a protocol may <u>not</u> allow Visitors to hand such items directly to a resident during a visit.

- viii. Except as listed below, each Visitor and Visitor group must maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing from all other groups and from all residents, including the resident they are visiting. No physical touching is allowed between a Visitor and any resident (meaning no hugging, hand-shaking, kissing, etc.). The Residential Facility must post signs outlining these rules, clearly mark spaces to prevent Visitor groups from being too close to each other or to residents, limit crowding, and increase the distance between groups as needed to ensure that people can hear each other without having to shout to be heard. Sample signs will be available online soon at https://www.sfcdcp.org/infectious-diseases-a-toz/coronavirus-2019-novel-coronavirus/coronavirus-2019information-for-healthcare-providers (under the "Long Term Care and Senior Care" list).
 - ix. No more than four Visitors from the same household are allowed. If visitors are from different households, the group of Visitors must be limited to two people total (one per different household). Visitation group size can be limited by the Resident Facility based on facility space or other safety considerations to allow for proper distancing.
 - x. The Residential Facility must screen visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms (as defined in Section 18.e below) prior to the start of the visit as outlined in Section 7 below. For Outdoor Visits, temperature screening of each Visitor is also required.
 - xi. No visitor who answers a screening question indicating they have any of the COVID-19 Symptoms or who otherwise



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- answers questions indicating that they have recent exposure to SARS-CoV-2 is allowed to visit.
- xii. Except for Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, the Residential Facility must require Visitors to perform hand hygiene in accordance with guidelines from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and provide supplies for hand hygiene such as hand sanitizer or a sink with soap, clean water, and towels as appropriate. More information on hand hygiene is available at https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/when-how-handwashing.html and https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/hand-sanitizer-use.html.
- xiii. The Residential Facility must routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces under the control of the Residential Facility in any area used for visits.
- xiv. Each visit is limited to one hour, and a Residential Facility may impose shorter time limits if needed to accommodate residents while ensuring compliance with the requirements of this Order. A Residential Facility may also limit the number of visits per resident each week, month, or otherwise in order to ensure that all residents are able to have visitors in a fair and equitable manner and take into account the context of a given resident.
- xv. A visit may be cancelled by the Residential Facility due to relevant considerations that impact Visitor, staff, or resident safety.
- xvi. Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the interior of a Residential Facility. If visitors must travel through the interior of a Residential Facility, the facility should have them take the shortest route possible. By way of example, it is acceptable for Visitors to walk through a facility's lobby to get to an outdoor garden or courtyard where Outdoor Visitation

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- occurs (so long as travel through the building is not restricted at the time under Section 6 below).
- xvii. Shouting, singing, or playing instruments that use the human breath (such as woodwind or brass instruments) is prohibited except when everyone is behind closed windows.
- xviii. Except for Vehicle Visitation, visitation by children is left to the discretion of the Residential Facility. If children are allowed to visit, all Visitors who are two years old and older must wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Also, screening for any COVID-19 Symptoms must take into account the different list of symptoms for youths under 18 years old (see Section 18.e below).
- b. Facility Window Visit Requirements. The term "Facility Window Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) are separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident. There are two types of Facility Window Visits: a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and resident is open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors; and a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident is closed so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window: a resident in their room on the first floor with window open to a garden or walkway where the Visitors are located; a resident in part of a common area that has privacy and a window that opens out on a parking lot where the Visitors are located; and a resident in a recreation room that has a sliding glass door open to a patio that is accessible to the Visitors. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window: a resident in their room on the first floor behind a closed window talking by phone with Visitors who are outside on a walkway or in a garden; a resident in a part of the facility lobby that has large windows that do not open talking by phone with Visitors who are on the other side of the window and distant from other people



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

entering the building; or a resident who is seated behind a door with a large window that is closed talking by phone with Visitors who are standing in a parking lot on the other side of the door.

Facility Window Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:

- i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
 - 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors.
 - 3. The resident must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
 - 4. Each Visitor must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
- ii. For Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
 - 2. All windows and doors separating the Visitor(s) and the resident are closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window.
 - 3. Each Visitor is <u>not</u> required to maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing the resident they are visiting because the windows and doors are closed.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- c. <u>Vehicle Visit Requirements</u>. The term "Vehicle Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) remain in a vehicle and the resident is at least six feet away from the vehicle. There are two types of



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Vehicle Visits: a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows, which is when any windows separating the Visitor(s) and resident are open; and a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows, which is when the resident is behind a closed window in the Residential Facility so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows: a resident in a wheelchair is positioned on a walkway near a parked car talking through open car windows with Visitors who are seated in the car; and a resident sitting outside on the patio of their room talking with Visitors through open car windows of a car parked nearby. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows: a resident standing at a window that does not open in the building lobby talking by phone with Visitors parked just outside in the parking lot; and a resident sitting at a closed window in their room talking by phone with Visitors parked on the street outside the window.

Vehicle Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:

- i. For Vehicle Visits with Open Windows:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be at least six feet away from any open window in the vehicle. The resident may be outdoors or indoors at the Residential Facility.
 - 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the vehicle remains outdoors.
 - 3. If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least six feet between residents and at least six feet between vehicles.
 - 4. To reduce air flow to the resident from the vehicle, the vehicle window that is closest to the resident should remain closed, if possible.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- ii. For Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows (which is similar to a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window):
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be indoors at the Residential Facility and at least six feet away from the vehicle.
 - 2. The Residential Facility windows separating the Visitor(s) and the resident must be closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The vehicle windows may be open or closed.
 - 3. If the vehicle is parked or stopped in an area were other people will be passing, each Visitor in the vehicle must wear a Face Covering. If the vehicle windows remain closed at all times, a Face Covering is not required for Visitors in the vehicle.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- d. Outdoor Visit Requirements. The term "Outdoor Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) and the resident are all in an outdoor setting. The following are examples of an Outdoor Visit: a resident who is brought to a garden in front of the facility where lines are marked to help keep them at least six feet away from Visitors who are outside in the same garden; a resident who is sitting in their wheelchair on a sidewalk where the resident is ten feet away from Visitors who are also on the sidewalk and behind an optional Plexiglas barrier that the facility has put up to help protect the resident; a resident who is seated in an interior courtyard that is open to the air where the Visitor is brought through the building lobby and then directed to remain at least six feet away during the outdoor visit; and a resident who is in the parking lot under a canopy tent that only has one wall for protection from the sun or other weather where the Visitor is also under the canopy at least six feet distant.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Outdoor Visits may only occur when all listed requirements are met. Those requirements are:

- i. The visit must occur outdoors. If the weather does not permit the Outdoor Visit to occur, the Residential Facility may postpone or cancel the visit or provide one of the other forms of visitation allowed by this Order in line with all listed requirements.
- ii. In addition to symptom screening and asking other screening questions of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit as required in Section 7 below, a Residential Facility must conduct temperature screening of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit.
- iii. If a Residential Facility uses a tent or other temporary structure in relation to an Outdoor Visit, the Residential Facility must follow the requirements of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h, including as that order is revised in the future. That order currently notes that operations under a tent, canopy, or other sun or weather shelter may occur only as long as no more than one side is of the structure is closed, allowing sufficient outdoor air movement.
- 6. COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions. For Allowed Visitation, there are certain prerequisites that apply to different kinds of visits, and if there is a COVID-19 outbreak at the Residential Facility, there are certain visitation restrictions that apply until the outbreak is resolved. Note that any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact the Department of Public Health Outbreak Management Group ("OMG") for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6. OMG may be reached by phone by calling 415-554-2830, selecting Option 1, and then following the prompts for Senior Care Facilities.
 - a. <u>Prerequisites</u>. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits:



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- i. No visit is allowed for any resident who has any of the COVID-19 Symptoms, is in isolation or quarantine related to COVID-19, or has a COVID-19 diagnosis; and
- ii. There must be an absence of new COVID-19 cases or SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Residential Facility for the preceding 14 days (including residents and staff) and the Residential Facility must not be in the surveillance period for an active outbreak.

If these prerequisites are not met, then the types of visits listed in this subsection a. may not occur until the prerequisites are met.

As noted above, any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact OMG for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6.

- b. <u>Visit-Related Outbreak Restrictions</u>. If there is reason to believe that the Residential Facility has had a new COVID-19 case or SARS-CoV-2 infection, the following restrictions apply:
 - i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits, Allowed Visitation must be postponed until the requirements of Section 6.a above are met. Residential Facilities with multiple units or floors may contact OMG to determine if the Residential Facility can safely cohort to allow visitation for residents in non-outbreak units.
 - ii. For Facility Window Visits with a Closed Window and Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, visitation may continue but each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.

Any Residential Facility that has questions about what constitutes an outbreak or other questions about this section may contact OMG.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- 7. Necessary Visitation. The term "Necessary Visitation" means a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait and that needs to occur in addition to Allowed Visitation. If the needs and context of a particular request for Necessary Visitation justifies visitation in a manner other than Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility Administrator may arrange for Necessary Visitation of a resident. For purposes of this Order, the Residential Facility Administrator may act through a designee. The decision about whether the needs and context justify Necessary Visitation is left to the determination of the Residential Facility Administrator, who must make the decision based on this Order and the COVID-19 Guidance. Also, any Necessary Visitation allowed under this Section must be done subject to requirements of the COVID-19 Guidance and as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Residential Facility. All Visitors allowed under this Section 6 must comply with subsections v, vii, x, xii, xiii, and xvii of the General Visitation Requirements above.
- 8. <u>Visitor Screening Procedures</u>. Each Residential Facility must use the following screening procedures for all Visitors. The Residential Facility must screen each Visitor on the day of the visit before the visit in a manner consistent with current DPH guidance (which takes into account guidance from CDPH and the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC")) regarding screening. At a minimum, the screening must address current or recent: actual or suspected COVID-19 diagnosis; actual or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection; actual or suspected close contact with someone with the virus; and COVID-19 Symptoms (listed below in

suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection; actual or suspected close contact with someone with the virus; and COVID-19 Symptoms (listed below in Section 18.e) consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection, taking into account the age of the person being screened given different criteria for people under 18 years old. If a Visitor answers affirmatively to any screening question, they should, if appropriate, be referred for testing and directed to the DPH website with information about Health Officer directives on isolation and quarantine and explanatory material in multiple languages, available online at https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19. Screening may be done by phone, verbally in person ensuring at least six feet of physical distance, or using other methods such as text or email. It is up to the Residential Facility, at the discretion of the Administrator or designee, to decide which method(s) for screening



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

work best for the context. A Residential Facility may use temperature checks consistent with DPH guidelines, and it must conduct temperature checks for Outdoor Visitation.

- 9. Other COVID-19 Related Protocols. The following sections list additional COVID-19 related protocols aimed at protecting residents, staff, and Visitors.
- 10. Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged. Each Residential Facility must discourage Non-Essential Resident Movement, as defined in Section 18.c below, onto and off of Residential Facility Premises where feasible. Whenever a Residential Facility resident leaves the Residential Facility Premises, the resident is ordered to comply with Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.0 of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. At the time this Order was issued, the Social Distancing Requirements are:
 - a. Maintaining at least six-foot social distancing from individuals who are not part of the same Household;
 - b. Frequently washing hands with soap and water for at least 20 seconds, or using hand sanitizer that is recognized by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as effective in combatting COVID-19;
 - c. Covering coughs and sneezes with a tissue or fabric or, if not possible, into the sleeve or elbow (but not into hands);
 - d. Wearing a face covering when out in public, consistent with the orders or guidance of the Health Officer; and
 - e. Avoiding all social interaction outside the Household when sick with a fever, cough, or other COVID-19 symptoms.
- 11. <u>Face Coverings</u>. In general, all residents, staff, and Visitors must comply with Order No. C19-12c of the Health Officer, issued on July 22, 2020 (the "Face Covering Order"), including as that order is revised in the future. Residents, staff, and Visitors must also comply with any



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

other requirements of the Residential Facility regarding wearing a mask or Face Covering or other Personal Protective Equipment ("PPE"). In addition to the exceptions to wearing a Face Covering listed in the Face Covering Order, a Face Covering is not required for any resident who, on account of dementia, grave mental illness, fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove a Face Covering, inability to call for help, physician order, or other circumstance should not wear a Face Covering. The Residential Facility must provide a Face Covering or other mask to any resident or Visitor on request. The Face Covering Order and this Order allow Residential Facilities to require and provide coverings that offer added protection such as an isolation mask or personal protective equipment ("PPE"), as appropriate in the circumstances.

12. Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement. Each Residential Facility must update and continue to implement the written plan that was originally required by the prior version of this Order (the "COVID-19 Plan"). This Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has written policies or other written guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan. The Residential Facility's existing COVID-19 Plan may be used while a new version is prepared, and the COVID-19 Plan should be updated no later than September 15, 2020. The plan must comply with applicable guidance from the DPH regarding the screening of patients, personnel, and visitors for signs of COVID-19 or other illnesses. The COVID-19 Plan must also address other applicable COVID-19-related guidance, including steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission by authorized Visitors and Non-Essential Persons such as through hand washing, use of Face Coverings, imposition of the Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.0 of the Stay-Safe-At-Home Order, and limiting the duration of visits, as appropriate. Nothing in this Order prohibits a Residential Facility from taking steps more protective against transmission of COVID-19 than guidance provided by the CDC, CDPH, and DPH in its plan. Each Residential Facility must update its **COVID-19 Plan when appropriate under new COVID-19** recommendations or requirements issued by DPH or as otherwise required by law. See the COVID-19 Guidance (discussed in Section 15 below) for more information about the COVID-19 Plan.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- 13. Staff Screening. Each Residential Facility's COIVD-19 Plan must also include a requirement that any employee or other staff member who is sick or does not pass the required screening must be immediately sent home and not return to work until they can do so safely under DPH guidance or authorized to return by a physician. If a Residential Facility is unable to immediately send home any such employee or staff member, the Residential Facility must (1) prevent that staff member from engaging in any resident care or contact and (2) immediately notify its respective licensing entity and seek guidance from that entity.
- 14. Staff and Resident Testing. On May 7, 2020, the Health Officer issued Order No. C19-13 regarding testing and infection control practices at congregate living facilities in the City, including each Residential Facility. Each Residential Facility is required to continue to comply with that order.
- 15. <u>COVID-19 Guidance</u>. Attached to this Order as <u>Appendix B</u> is written guidance to Residential Facilities ("COVID-19 Guidance") issued by the Health Officer. The Health Officer or designee may revise the COVID-19 Guidance in writing from time to time. Each Residential Facility must follow the COVID-19 Guidance.
- 16. Non-Compliance. If any Visitor or Non-Essential Person refuses to comply with this Order, then the Residential Facility may contact the San Francisco Police Department to request assistance in enforcing this Order. The Residential Facility shall take whatever steps are possible within the bounds of the law to protect residents from any such Visitor or person who refuses to comply with this Order. For example, a Residential Facility should contact facility security and ask the unauthorized visitor or person to comply with conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility. Even if a Visitor or Non-Essential Person otherwise complies with the facility's visitation protocols as outlined in this paragraph, they are still in violation of this Order if their presence is not an Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation under this Order.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

- 17. No Restriction on First Responders, Others. This Order does not restrict first responder access to Residential Facility Premises during an emergency. Further, this Order does not restrict state or federal officers, investigators, or medical or law enforcement personnel from carrying out their lawful duties on Residential Facility Premises. Persons other than first responders allowed access under this paragraph must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Residential Facility Premises when feasible.
- 18. <u>Definitions</u>: For the purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below:
 - a. "Visitors" are people who come onsite to a Residential Facility to meet with a resident who are not staff of the facility. This term includes family members and loved ones of residents and those who have legal authority to make healthcare or other legal decisions for a resident. The Ombudsperson is an authorized visitor and is <u>not</u> included in this term, but the Ombudsperson must still follow all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility and should also try to avoid non-essential visits.
 - b. "Non-Essential Personnel" are employees, contractors, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. Refer to the COVID-19 Guidance for more information.
 - c. "Non-Essential Resident Movement" means travel off or onto Residential Facility Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes as described more fully in the COVID-19 Guidance.
 - d. "Premises" includes without limitation the buildings, grounds, facilities, driveways, parking areas, and public spaces within the legal boundaries of each Residential Facility listed in Section 20

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

below.

- e. "COVID-19 Symptom" means a symptom consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection. At the time this Order is issued, that list includes for individuals 18 years or older any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); cough; sore throat; shortness of breath; chills; headache; body aches; fatigue; loss of smell or taste; diarrhea; runny nose; nasal congestion; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19. For those younger than 18 years, "COVID-19 Symptom" means any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); sore throat; new uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline); diarrhea, vomiting, or abdominal pain; new onset of severe headache, especially with a fever; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19.
- 19. <u>Licensing Entity Notification</u>. Each Residential Facility must within 12 hours of receipt of this Order notify its respective licensing entity (whether the California Department of Public Health or otherwise) of the existence of this Order regarding the Residential Facility. And as noted in Section 5 above, if a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CDPH with an explanation of why it is unable to offer such visitation.
- 20.<u>List of Residential Facilities</u>. This Order applies to each facility listed below (each a Residential Facility):

Residential Facility Name	Street Address	ZIP
Lawton Skilled Nursing & Rehabilitation Center	1575 7th Ave	94122
San Francisco Health Care	1477 Grove St	94117

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Central Gardens Post Acute	1355 Ellis St	94115
San Francisco Post Acute	5767 Mission	94112
	St	
Hayes Convalescent Hospital	1250 Hayes	94117
	St	
Heritage on The Marina	3400 Laguna	94123
_	St	
The Avenues Transitional Care Center	2043 19th	94116
	Ave	
Laurel Heights Community Care	2740	94115
	California St	
Pacific Heights Transitional Care Center	2707 Pine St	94115
Tunnell Skilled Nursing & Rehabilitation	1359 Pine St	94109
Center		
Sequoias San Francisco Convalescent	1400 Geary	94109
Hospital	Blvd	
Sheffield Convalescent Hospital	1133 S Van	94110
	Ness Ave	
St. Anne's Home	300 Lake St	94118
Victorian Post Acute	2121 Pine St	94115
California Pacific Medical Center - Davies	601 Duboce	94117
Campus Hospital D/P SNF	Ave	
Jewish Home & Rehab Center D/P SNF	302 Silver	94112
	Ave	
San Francisco Towers	1661 Pine St	94109
Kentfield San Francisco Hospital	450 Stanyan	94117
_	St, 6th Floor	
*Note: Laguna Honda Hospital and ZSFG		
D/P SNF are covered under a separate order		

21. Complaints. A Residential Facility resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative may contact a representative of the Residential Facility to seek clarification of any part of this Order by contacting the Administrator of the facility. If a resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative objects to the appropriateness of the limitation of access contained in this Order, the resident or lawful authorized



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

representative must first raise their concern with the Residential Facility at issue. The Residential Facility is ordered to respond to the concern within 2 business days.

- 22. Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19. This Order is issued based on the need for continued protection of all Residential Facility Visitors, residents, and staff in the City. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Residents at Residential Facilities are among the most vulnerable and most likely to face serious outcomes, including death, from infection by SARS-CoV-2. There are currently only limited treatments and not approved vaccine for COVID-19, and there is a high risk of infection from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people who have the virus. Due to the length of time during which people with the virus can unknowingly infect others, it is imperative that all appropriate steps be taken to protect residents and staff who deal with residents from infection. Limiting visitors and requiring the other safety protections included in this Order will thereby slow virus transmission as much as possible in order to protect the most vulnerable, prevent infections and serious illness and death, and prevent the healthcare system from being overwhelmed.
- 23. Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths. As of September 1, 2020, there are 9,755 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the City (up from 37 on March 16, 2020, the day before the first shelter-in-place order in the City went into effect) as well as at least 84 deaths (up from 1 death on March 17, 2020). This information, as well as information regarding hospitalizations and hospital capacity, is regularly updated on the San Francisco Department of Public Health's website at https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/fjki-2fab.
- 24. <u>Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State</u> Health Orders.
 - a. <u>State and Local Emergency Proclamations</u>. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency issued by Mayor London Breed, as supplemented on March 11, 2020, the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health, as each of them have been and may be supplemented.

- b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the March 19, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer (the "State Shelter Order"), which set baseline statewide restrictions on non-residential Business activities, effective until further notice, the Governor's March 19, 2020 Executive Order N-33-20 directing California residents to follow the State Shelter Order, and the July 13, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer. The May 4, 2020 Executive Order issued by Governor Newsom and May 7, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer permit certain Businesses to reopen if a local health officer believes the conditions in that jurisdictions warrant it, but expressly acknowledge the authority of local health officers to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer. Also on June 18, 2020, the State Department of Public Health issued guidance for the use of face coverings, requiring all people in the State to wear face coverings in certain high-risk situations, subject to limited exceptions.
- 25. Effective Date. This Order becomes effective at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Effective as of 9 a.m. on September 5, 2020, this Order revises and replaces Health Officer Order No. C19-03, issued March 10, 2020.
- 26. Reporting Violations. Any person who believes this Order is being violated may contact 3-1-1 or go to www.sf.gov/report-health-order-violation to provide information about the alleged violation.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

27. Copies and Notice. Each Residential Facility must promptly provide notice of this Order as follows: (1) by posting this Order on the Residential Facility website (if any); (2) by posting this Order at all entrances to the Residential Facility; (3) by providing a summary of this Order to each Residential Facility resident, indicating how the resident can obtain a full copy; (4) by providing a summary of this Order to any authorized decision maker for each Residential Facility resident if not the resident, including any conservator, indicating how the decision maker can obtain a full copy; (5) by providing this Order to the Residential Facility Ombudsperson (if any); and (6) by giving a copy to anyone who visits the Residential Facility or who contacts the Residential Facility seeking to visit.

The City must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the Department of Public Health website at www.sfdph.org/healthorders; (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

- 28. Severability. If any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other people or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.
- 29. Interpretation. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the intent of this Order as described in Section 1 above. The summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order; in the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized



Date: September 4, 2020

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-03b

terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,

Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

Note: This document provides a summary for convenience of the requirements for Allowed Visitation under Section 5 of the Order. Each Residential Facility must comply with all requirements of the Order, regardless of what is listed below.

FACILITY VISITATION PREREQUISITES		
VISITATION TYPE PREREQUISITES		
Outdoor Visits	1. No visitation for residents with symptoms, in isolation or COVID+ and quarantine	
Facility Window Visits with		
an Open Window	2. Absence of any new COVID-19 cases in the facility for 14	
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows	days, either residents or staff, AND not currently in the surveillance period for an active outbreak	
Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window / Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows	Visitor(s) do not walk through the facility (Note that items 1. and 2. above do not apply for closed-window visits)	

In the event of a new COVID-19 case at the facility,		
take the following actions until the following visitation prerequisites are met:		
VISITATION TYPE ACTION		
Outdoor Visits	Suspend/Postpone	
Facility Window Visits with an Open Window	For facilities with multiple units/floors, contact the DPH / OMG¹ to determine if the facility can safely cohort to allow visitation	
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows	for residents in non-outbreak units.	
Facility Window Visit with a		
Closed Window /	Allow as long as the visitor(s) do not walk through the facility	
Vehicle Visits with Closed	This is as inc visitor (s) as not train through the ladinty	
Facility Windows		

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Outdoor Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS		
Outdoor Visits	☐ Visits must be supervised by facility staff at all times.		
	Visitation in outdoor settings only.		
Definition: Visitor	 If weather does not permit, provide window or vehicle 		
and Resident are	visits.		
both in an outdoor setting	Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours.		
	☐ Visitor(s) must wear masks. Residents must wear masks or other face coverings (as tolerated). ²		
	 G-feet or more physical distancing (no physical touching between resident and visitor such as hugging, hand-shaking, etc.) It is the facility's responsibility to monitor and ensure compliance. It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(s) groups from being too close to each other. No more than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are from different households, the group should be limited to 2 visitors. Visitation group size can be determined based on facility space to allow for proper distancing and safety. Visitation by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If children are allowed to visit, all visitors ages 2+ should wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Screening should take into account age-specific symptoms. Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues and conduct temperature check prior to visit. Perform hand hygiene in accordance with CDC guidelines (provide supplies as needed). Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces. Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any inperson visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for 		
	 □ Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surface □ Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during an person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and 		

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

 Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules. Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the facility or walking the shortest route through the facility.

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Facility Window Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS
For All window	Visits must be supervised by facility staff at all times
visits:	Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine
	visiting hours.
	☐ No more than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are
	from different households, the group should be limited to 2
	visitors. Visitation group size can be determined based on facility
	space to allow for proper distancing and safety.
	☐ Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit.
	☐ Facility should have a phone available to speak to resident at a
	safe distance.
	☐ If the resident must be taken to any of the designated areas, the
	resident must wear a mask (as tolerated) ² for that journey.
	Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitor(s)
	walking through the facility or walking the shortest route through
	the facility.
	Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-
	person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a
	separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and
	processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for
	disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be
	exchanged directly during the visit. Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.
	☐ Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to
	accommodate residents while assuring compliance with visitation
	rules.
	☐ Visitation by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If
	children are allowed to visit, all visitors ages 2+ should wear a
	face covering, and children must be under supervision at all
	times. Screening should take into account age-specific symptoms.
	Symptoms.

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

Resident must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask (as tolerated). ²
Visitor(s) must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask.
☐ Facility should ensure that visitors seeing different residents can also keep at least 6 feet apart (limit crowding) and farther if needed so people can hear without shouting. It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(s) groups from being too close to each other.
If the visitor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the
visitor(s) must wear masks.

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Vehicle Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS		
For All Vehicle	Visits to be supervised by facility staff at all times.		
Visits:	Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine		
	visiting hours.		
	Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit.		
	Facility should have a phone available to speak to resident at a		
	safe distance.		
	lacktriangle If the resident must be taken to any of the designated areas, the		
	resident must wear a mask (as tolerated)* for that journey.		
	☐ Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any inperson visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be		
	exchanged directly during the visit.		
	Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.		
	Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to		
	accommodate residents while assuring compliance with visitation		
	rules.		
Vehicle Visits	Resident should stay at least 6 feet back from the vehicle window		
with Open	and wear a mask (as tolerated). ²		
Windows	Visitor(s) must wear a mask.		
- C	If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be		
Definition:	scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least 6 feet between		
Visitor(s), in a	residents.		
vehicle, and Resident are	☐ To reduce air flow to the resident, if possible, keep vehicle's		
• •	willdow closest to the resident closed.		
space or in the			
separated by at least 6 feet of distance where the Resident is in either an outdoor space or in the	window closest to the resident closed.		

Appendix A - Allowed Visitation Summary

Facility behind an open window	
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows	☐ If the visitor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the visitor(s) must wear masks in the vehicle.
Definition: Visitor(s), in a vehicle, and Resident are separated by a Closed Facility Window. At all times, the facility window must remain closed so no air flow is exchanged.	

- ¹ Contact DPH Outbreak Management Group (OMG) with any specific questions for their sites and guidance. Call 415-554-2830, select Option 1, and then follow the prompts for Senior Care Facilities. See Section 6 of the Order for details.
- ² Requirements for masks or face coverings are relaxed for residents as follows and for related/similar issues: a diagnosis of dementia or grave mental illness; fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove or call for help <u>OR</u> ordered by physician. See Section 11 of the Order for details.



APPENDIX B: WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-03b

DATE ORDER ISSUED: September 4, 2020

This information (the "COVID-19 Guidance") is meant to help each Residential Facility when implementing the Order to which it is attached. This document uses the terms defined in the Order.

- 1. For purposes of the Order, the term "Administrator" means the administrator of a Residential Facility or the administrator's designee.
- 2. The Order does not prohibit a Residential Facility from being more restrictive in its operations and practices than is outlined in the Order. The Order also does not require allowing visitation when not otherwise required by applicable laws or regulations.
- 3. Guidance regarding Section 12 (the COVID-19 Plan): The Order requires the Residential Facility to create a COVID-19 Plan that addresses issues including: 1) screening of residents, staff, and Visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms or other illness; 2) conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises for authorized visitors that reduce the risk of infection, such as thorough hand washing, appropriate use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), maintaining at least six feet distance from other people, and limiting the duration of visits, as appropriate; 3) sending sick employees home immediately; 4) notifying DPH and other regulators of any positive SARS-CoV-2 result for a resident or staff member, including as required by law; and 5) other CDC or CDPH requirements. Note that the Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has policies or other guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan.

The COVID-19 Plan should also address how the facility can reduce the risk of unnecessary exposure as outlined in the San Francisco Department of Public Health Social Distancing Protocol, attached as Appendix A to Health Officer Order No. C19-07h (or as that order is revised in the future). For example, the facility should avoid large in-person gatherings of residents or staff, instead holding smaller gatherings that still meet the facility's mission



WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-03b

and needs (e.g., substituting unit-based activities for a facility-wide bingo event). Similarly, postponing large staff meetings or having meetings occur by phone can help when feasible.

Additionally, there may be areas that warrant limitations that are not normally in place. A Residential Facility may have a cafeteria or other concession that is normally available to residents, essential employees, other employees (such as others who share the building but are not associated with the healthcare mission of the facility), and Visitors. While this Order is in effect, the Residential Facility should consider whether a restriction on such use makes sense. One option might be to limit cafeteria visits to residents and essential staff and temporarily block other employees and Visitors from that area.

If the facility had plans to have vendors come onsite for meetings or to show sample products, those meetings should be conducted via remote communication, occur at another site that does not include a vulnerable population, or be postponed until after this emergency situation if possible.

- 4. <u>Guidance regarding Section 4 (efforts to facilitate contact that is not inperson)</u>: The Order requires the Residential Facility to make reasonable efforts to facilitate contact that is not in person between a Visitor or Non-Essential Personnel and a resident. Such efforts include using technology to facilitate a remote connection with the resident when possible and would include telephone calls, telephone conferences involving multiple people, and video conferences using appropriate technology. Efforts are not reasonable if they interfere with the Residential Facility's healthcare mission or if they are not available or are cost prohibitive. The Residential Facility is encouraged to be creative in trying to facilitate contact that is not in-person so long as it complies with its other legal and regulatory obligations.
- 5. <u>Guidance regarding Section 7 (Necessary Visitation)</u>: The term Necessary Visitation refers to a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait until later. Nothing in the Order limits the standard healthcare that the Residential Facility provides to a resident. When medical care is appropriate or required, it is by definition permitted under the Order. Necessary Visitation refers to other types of visits or contact that are time-sensitive or critical. For example, a resident may be in



WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-03b

the end stages of life. In that instance, family or loved ones should be allowed to be with the resident unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission in light of the current emergency, such as during a serious outbreak of cases. Another example would be a resident who is updating their will or other legal papers and an in-person meeting with the lawyer or family members or a notary is required, again unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission. But, a meeting with a lawyer to discuss future changes or other, non-urgent issues should generally be postponed or conducted via telephone or other means.

Anyone who is legally authorized to make decisions for the resident, whether by operation of a durable power of attorney or public or private conservatorship, must be given special consideration, especially if they need to meet in person with the resident to fulfill their role. This distinction is in place because decisions regarding care when there is a surrogate decision maker should not be delayed when in-person contact is needed, whereas visits by other family or loved ones are important but may not be timesensitive. But such authorized decision-makers should be encouraged to use alternative methods of contacting the resident when possible in order to avoid exposing the resident and others.

Also, Necessary Visitation should <u>not</u> be granted for routine visits by decision makers, family, or loved ones, even if the resident very much looks forward to the visit or the visitor has a strong desire for the visit. Such routine visits put all residents at risk at this time and may only occur as Allowed Visitation. But if a family member or loved one plays an essential role in providing care to a resident, without which the resident will suffer medical or clinical harm, Necessary Visitation may be appropriate.

There may be other unique situations that justify a Necessary Visitation based on the context. And as the situation evolves, the Residential Facility may need to restrict Necessary Visitation. This Order is intended to give the Administrator flexibility in making that determination so long as the decision is in line with the Order and this COVID-19 Guidance. The Administrator should not authorize Necessary Visitation for all or a majority of residents as that would likely reflect a violation of the intent of the Order to protect all residents from the risks of non-essential exposure to COVID-19.



WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-03b

All visits allowed as Necessary Visitation must occur subject to all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.

- 6. Guidance regarding Sections 3 and 18.b (Non-Essential Personnel): The Order defines Non-Essential Personnel as employees, contractors, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. This term also includes employees of the Residential Facility or its vendors (and their employees) who are not needed in the short term for the facility to perform its healthcare mission. For example, a vendor that makes deliveries of large bottled water refill jugs is likely not essential. However, the facility should work to see if there are ways to permit delivery, such as on a loading dock, which would eliminate the need in the short term for someone to make visits all across the facility. This Order grants the Administrator authority to make judgment calls about how best to ensure the facility is able to operate during this emergency situation.
- 7. Guidance regarding Section 18.c (Non-Essential Resident Movement): The Order defines Non-Essential Resident Movement as travel off or onto Residential Facility Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes. This is contrasted with situations when a resident leaves the facility for health-related purposes or as required by law, such as for a meeting or service mandated by a court. The goal of the Order is to encourage residents to limit Non-Essential Resident Movement.

* * *

Dated: September 4, 2020



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES (RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES FOR
THE ELDERLY, ADULT RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES, AND
RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES FOR THE CHRONICALLY ILL) TO
LIMIT VISITORS AND OTHER NON-ESSENTIAL PERSONS AND TO
PREPARE WRITTEN PROTOCOLS REGARDING COVID-19,
INCLUDING RESTRICTIONS ON AND SCREENING OF VISITORS AND
OTHER PROTECTIONS FOR RESIDENTS, VISITORS, AND
PERSONNEL

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ORDER)

DATE OF ORDER: September 4, 2020

Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120275, 120295, et seq.; Cal. Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); San Francisco Administrative Code §7.17(b))

Summary: On February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") declared a state of emergency to prepare for coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19"). On March 5, 2020 there was the first reported case of COVID-19 in the City. On March 16, 2020, the City and five other Bay Area counties and the City of Berkeley, working together, were the first in the State to implement shelter-in-place orders in a collective effort to reduce the impact of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. That virus is easily transmitted, especially indoors or in group settings, and the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those who are older or have underlying health conditions and known to be at high risk, but also other people, regardless of age. And a major risk remains the spread of the virus that causes COVID-19 through asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic carriers, people who can spread the disease but do not even know they are infected and contagious. The spread of disease is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm.

On March 7, 2020, the City's Health Officer issued Order No. C19-01, limiting visitors and non-essential personnel from Laguna Honda Hospital, one of the largest skilled nursing facilities in the country. On March 10, 2020, Health Officer Order No. C19-03 was issued to extend similar restrictions and other safety measures to other skilled nursing and residential facilities in the City. Order No. C19-01 was expanded on March 11, 2020, to include the skilled nursing unit at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and add the additional safety requirements. On March 18, 2020, the Health



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

Officer issued Order No. C19-09, the prior version of this Order, extending similar restrictions and protections to Residential Care Facilities For The Elderly, Adult Residential Facilities, And Residential Care Facilities For The Chronically Ill in the City. Collectively, these orders served to protect residents and staff at residential living facilities in the City.

Some residents of community living facilities are being treated for health conditions that make them particularly vulnerable to suffering the most serious complications of COVID-19, including death. Community living settings also make it easier for the virus to spread. And medical personnel and other essential staff of hospitals and residential facilities are experiencing increased stress associated with providing excellent support during this public health emergency. It is critical to protect all these populations from avoidable exposure to the disease and other pathogens. At the same time, allowing visitation in such settings is also important to the health and well-being of residents, many of whom have gone without in-person visits for almost six months. The Health Officer and the Department of Public Health ("DPH") have been reviewing the literature and data to help craft rules that will expand visitation in safer ways while also continuing to protect these populations.

Although our collective effort has had a positive impact on limiting the spread of the virus, key concerns remain. The number of infections and infection rate in the City remain high, and it is anticipated that infection rates will continue to increase as we enter the Fall (when the flu and colds could negatively impact health in these facilities) and other activities are further allowed under state and local orders. We are going to have to live with the threat of the virus for many months to come.

This Order expands visitation at the listed Residential Facilities, accomplishing the purpose of strengthening our community social distancing response, protecting medical resources and healthcare providers, and supporting the well-being of residents by allowing for in-person visits when they can be done safely. The Order gives such facilities flexibility to allow three new kinds of visitation: outdoor visits (where resident and visitor are outside), vehicle-based visits (where the visitors remain in a vehicle), and facility window visits (where the resident remains in the building behind a window or door with a window). This Order lists many requirements for allowing such visits, including mandatory screening of visitors on the day of the visit, mandatory physical distancing, wearing a face covering as required by Health Officer Order No. C19-12c, a prohibition on direct exchange of gifts or other items between the resident and visitors, a requirement that visits be scheduled in advance, restrictions on the length of visits and how many visitors are allowed, and other protections. Residential Facilities are given leeway to determine how to safely offer such visits and what kinds of visits they wish to offer, although they must contact the Community Care Licensing Division of the California Department of Social Services ("CCL") if they are unable to allow for some version of this expanded visitation.

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

This Order also makes other changes, cleaning up the prior requirements, adding a checklist of key visitation requirements, and requiring Residential Facilities to notify residents and authorized decision makers of these changes. This Order goes into effect at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, revises and replaces the prior version (Order No. C19-09) as of that time and date, and will remain in effect until extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer.

Table of Contents:

Intent		4
Gener	ral Requirements	4
Visita	tion Restrictions and Requirements	4
Types	s of Visitation	4
Allow	ved Visitation	5
	-	
	•	
COVI	ID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions	. 1
	•	
Visito	or Screening Procedures	.3
Other	COVID-19 Related Protocols	3
. Nor	n-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged	.3
. Fac	e Coverings	4
. Wri	itten COVID-19 Plan Requirement 1	4
. Stat	ff Screening1	4
. Stat	ff and Resident Testing1	.5
. CO	VID-19 Guidance	5
. Nor	n-Compliance	5
. No	Restriction on First Responders, Others	5
. Def	finitions1	5
. Lice	ensing Entity Notification1	6
. List	t of Residential Facilities	7
. Cor	mplaints2	<u>.</u> 1
	Gener Visita Types Allow a. Gen b. Fac c. Vel d. Out COVI a. Pre b. Visito Other Non Fac Wrista Sta Sta CO Non Def Lic Lis	b. Facility Window Visit Requirements. c. Vehicle Visit Requirements. d. Outdoor Visit Requirements. d. Outdoor Visit Requirements. 1 COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions. 1 a. Prerequisites. 1 b. Visit-Related Outbreak Restrictions. 1 Necessary Visitation. 1 Visitor Screening Procedures. 1 Other COVID-19 Related Protocols. 1 Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged. 1 Face Coverings. 1 Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement. 1 Staff Screening. 1 Staff and Resident Testing. 1 COVID-19 Guidance. 1 Non-Compliance. 1 Non-Compliance. 1 No Restriction on First Responders, Others. 1 Definitions. 1 Licensing Entity Notification. 1 List of Residential Facilities.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

22.	Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19	21
23.	Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths	21
24.	Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State Health Orders	22
a. b.	State and Local Emergency Proclamations	
25.	Effective Date	
26.	Reporting Violations.	22
27.	Copies and Notice	23
28.	Severability	23
29.	Interpretation	23

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (THE "HEALTH OFFICER") ORDERS:

- 1. <u>Intent</u>. The intent of this Order is to ensure that residents, staff, and Visitors at each long-term care residential facility listed in Section 20 below (each a "Residential Facility") are protected from the spread of COVID-19 to the greatest extent possible given how vulnerable most residents at Residential Facilities in the City are to the disease and how easy it is to transmit the SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, especially from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people. Other capitalized terms in this Order are defined throughout this Order.
- 2. General Requirements. While this Order is in effect, each Residential Facility and the staff of each such Residential Facility must comply with the visitation and COVID-19 related protocols listed by this Order as well as all other requirements of this Order. Visitors allowed under this Order must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by this Order and by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.
- 3. <u>Visitation Restrictions and Requirements</u>. Each Residential Facility and its staff must exclude from entry or access to its Premises any Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel including, but not limited to, visitors of residents at the Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order. Such Visitors and Non-Essential Personnel, including but not limited to authorized decision-makers and family members of residents, are ordered not to visit any Residential Facility except as allowed by this Order.
- 4. <u>Types of Visitation</u>. This Order restricts onsite visits between Residential Facility residents and Visitors. When Visitors seek to visit or contact a resident, the



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

Residential Facility may allow visitation or contact only in the following ways. First, each Residential Facility must make reasonable efforts to facilitate such contact by remote means such as telephone or videoconference that do not expose the resident to in-person contact. Second, each Residential Facility may authorize Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation on a case-by-case basis using the following protocols and other protocols regarding visitation it puts in place. Based on the context, a Residential Facility may refuse Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation when visits cannot occur in a manner that protects the health and welfare of the resident, the Visitor, and Residential Facility personnel. Each Residential Facility must monitor and ensure compliance with the requirements of this Order.

5. Allowed Visitation. The term "Allowed Visitation" means an in-person visit or contact that occurs between a resident and a Visitor under this Section 5. Allowed Visitation includes Facility Window Visits, Vehicle Visits, and Outdoor Visits, each as defined in this Section. Allowed Visitation, regardless of type, may only occur when the Residential Facility complies with all General Visitation Requirements listed below and also each requirement that applies to the specific type of visit. The checklist attached as Appendix A to this Order outlines most requirements for Allowed Visitation, but all requirements listed in the body of this Order must be met. Each Residential Facility should offer at least one type of Allowed Visitation except when that cannot be done safely and is encouraged to offer multiple types when staffing, resources, and the context permit doing so safely. If a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CCL with an explanation of why it is unable to offer such visitation. Safety considerations for visits include not only COVID-19-related issues but more typical resident safety issues to ensure that risks to resident safety and well-being are minimized whenever possible.

In relation to implementation of Allowed Visitation, a Residential Facility may utilize trained volunteers to help meet the requirements of this Order so long as such volunteers, if onsite, are screened and meet other applicable requirements for staff. Examples of each type of Allowed Visitation are included below, and these are for illustration purposes and are not intended to show the only way that visitation may occur. This Order gives discretion to each Residential Facility to implement visitation in the ways that make the most sense and that protect resident, staff, and Visitor safety in the facility's unique setting.

- a. <u>General Visitation Requirements</u>. Each visit that occurs as an Allowed Visitation must comply with all of the following requirements (the "General Visitation Requirements"):
 - i. All visits are subject to the COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions listed in Section 6 below.



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

- ii. The visit must be supervised by Residential Facility staff or trained, screened volunteers for the duration of the visit.
- iii. The visit must be planned in advance with the Residential Facility, and the Residential Facility may determine the visitation hours for each type of Allowed Visitation.
- iv. The Residential Facility must designate an appropriate area for the type of Allowed Visitation. If the Residential Facility does not have an area that meets all requirements a specific type of Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility must not allow that type of Allowed Visitation to occur.
- v. When a resident moves to or is transported to any area designated for Allowed Visitation, the resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for that journey. Except as listed below, a resident must wear a Face Covering (as tolerated) for the duration of the visit. Except as listed below, each Visitor must wear a Face Covering at all times. The rules regarding Face Coverings are listed below in Section 11.
- vi. The Residential Facility must provide a telephone on request to any resident who remains inside the building during a visit so that Visitors can safely communicate with the resident, such as from afar or through closed windows.
- vii. Sharing items between Visitors and residents, including gifts, flowers, reading materials, games, food, drinks, or utensils, during any visit is not allowed. A Residential Facility may adopt a protocol for allowing Visitors or others to send or deliver items or gifts to residents through Residential Facility staff so long as the protocol addresses how to ensure resident safety and minimize the risk of disease transmission through surface contact. Such a protocol may not allow Visitors to hand such items directly to a resident during a visit.
- viii. Except as listed below, each Visitor and Visitor group must maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing from all other groups and from all residents, including the resident they are visiting. No physical touching is allowed between a Visitor and any resident (meaning no hugging, hand-shaking, kissing, etc.). The Residential Facility must post signs outlining these rules, clearly mark spaces to prevent Visitor groups from being too close to each other or to residents, limit crowding, and increase the distance between groups as needed to ensure that people can hear each other without having to shout to be heard. Sample signs will be available online soon at https://www.sfcdcp.org/infectious-diseases-a-to-z/coronavirus-2019-



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

<u>novel-coronavirus/coronavirus-2019-information-for-healthcare-providers</u> (under the "Long Term Care and Senior Care" list).

- ix. No more than four Visitors from the same household are allowed. If visitors are from different households, the group of Visitors must be limited to two people total (one per different household). Visitation group size can be limited by the Resident Facility based on facility space or other safety considerations to allow for proper distancing.
- x. The Residential Facility must screen visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms (as defined in Section 18.e below) prior to the start of the visit as outlined in Section 7 below. For Outdoor Visits, temperature screening of each Visitor is also required.
- xi. No visitor who answers a screening question indicating they have any of the COVID-19 Symptoms or who otherwise answers questions indicating that they have recent exposure to SARS-CoV-2 is allowed to visit.
- xii. Except for Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, the Residential Facility must require Visitors to perform hand hygiene in accordance with guidelines from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and provide supplies for hand hygiene such as hand sanitizer or a sink with soap, clean water, and towels as appropriate. More information on hand hygiene is available at https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/when-how-handwashing.html and https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/hand-sanitizer-use.html.
- xiii. The Residential Facility must routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces under the control of the Residential Facility in any area used for visits.
- xiv. Each visit is limited to one hour, and a Residential Facility may impose shorter time limits if needed to accommodate residents while ensuring compliance with the requirements of this Order. A Residential Facility may also limit the number of visits per resident each week, month, or otherwise in order to ensure that all residents are able to have visitors in a fair and equitable manner and take into account the context of a given resident.
- xv. A visit may be cancelled by the Residential Facility due to relevant considerations that impact Visitor, staff, or resident safety.
- xvi. Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the interior of a Residential Facility. If visitors must travel through the interior of a Residential Facility, the facility should



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

have them take the shortest route possible. By way of example, it is acceptable for Visitors to walk through a facility's lobby to get to an outdoor garden or courtyard where Outdoor Visitation occurs (so long as travel through the building is not restricted at the time under Section 6 below).

- xvii. Shouting, singing, or playing instruments that use the human breath (such as woodwind or brass instruments) is prohibited except when everyone is behind closed windows.
- xviii. Except for Vehicle Visitation, visitation by children is left to the discretion of the Residential Facility. If children are allowed to visit, all Visitors who are two years old and older must wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Also, screening for any COVID-19 Symptoms must take into account the different list of symptoms for youths under 18 years old (see Section 18.e below).
- b. Facility Window Visit Requirements. The term "Facility Window Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) are separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident. There are two types of Facility Window Visits: a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and resident is open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors; and a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window, which is when the window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident is closed so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with an Open Window: a resident in their room on the first floor with window open to a garden or walkway where the Visitors are located; a resident in part of a common area that has privacy and a window that opens out on a parking lot where the Visitors are located; and a resident in a recreation room that has a sliding glass door open to a patio that is accessible to the Visitors. The following are examples of a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window: a resident in their room on the first floor behind a closed window talking by phone with Visitors who are outside on a walkway or in a garden; a resident in a part of the facility lobby that has large windows that do not open talking by phone with Visitors who are on the other side of the window and distant from other people entering the building; or a resident who is seated behind a door with a large window that is closed talking by phone with Visitors who are standing in a parking lot on the other side of the door.

Facility Window Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:

i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window:



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

- 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
- 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the Visitor(s) are outdoors.
- 3. The resident must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
- 4. Each Visitor must stay at least 3 feet back from the window.
- ii. For Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must be separated by a building window (or door with a window) from the resident.
 - 2. All windows and doors separating the Visitor(s) and the resident are closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window.
 - 3. Each Visitor is <u>not</u> required to maintain at least six feet or more of physical distancing the resident they are visiting because the windows and doors are closed.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- c. Vehicle Visit Requirements. The term "Vehicle Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) remain in a vehicle and the resident is at least six feet away from the vehicle. There are two types of Vehicle Visits: a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows, which is when any windows separating the Visitor(s) and resident are open; and a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows, which is when the resident is behind a closed window in the Residential Facility so no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Open Windows: a resident in a wheelchair is positioned on a walkway near a parked car talking through open car windows with Visitors who are seated in the car; and a resident sitting outside on the patio of their room talking with Visitors through open car windows of a car parked nearby. The following are examples of a Vehicle Visit with Closed Facility Windows: a resident standing at a window that does not open in the building lobby talking by phone with Visitors parked just outside in the parking lot; and a resident sitting at a closed window in their room talking by phone with Visitors parked on the street outside the window.

Vehicle Visits may only occur when all listed requirements for that type of visit are met. Those requirements are:



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

- i. For Vehicle Visits with Open Windows:
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be at least six feet away from any open window in the vehicle. The resident may be outdoors or indoors at the Residential Facility.
 - 2. The window separating the Visitor(s) and the resident may be open and the vehicle remains outdoors.
 - 3. If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least six feet between residents and at least six feet between vehicles.
 - 4. To reduce air flow to the resident from the vehicle, the vehicle window that is closest to the resident should remain closed, if possible.
- ii. For Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows (which is similar to a Facility Window Visit with a Closed Window):
 - 1. The Visitor(s) must remain in a vehicle and the resident must be indoors at the Residential Facility and at least six feet away from the vehicle.
 - 2. The Residential Facility windows separating the Visitor(s) and the resident must be closed so that no airflow occurs between the two sides of the window. The vehicle windows may be open or closed.
 - 3. If the vehicle is parked or stopped in an area were other people will be passing, each Visitor in the vehicle must wear a Face Covering. If the vehicle windows remain closed at all times, a Face Covering is not required for Visitors in the vehicle.
 - 4. Each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.
- d. Outdoor Visit Requirements. The term "Outdoor Visit" refers a visit where the Visitor(s) and the resident are all in an outdoor setting. The following are examples of an Outdoor Visit: a resident who is brought to a garden in front of the facility where lines are marked to help keep them at least six feet away from Visitors who are outside in the same garden; a resident who is sitting in their wheelchair on a sidewalk where the resident is ten feet away from Visitors who are also on the sidewalk and behind an optional Plexiglas barrier that the facility has put up to help protect the resident; a resident



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

who is seated in an interior courtyard that is open to the air where the Visitor is brought through the building lobby and then directed to remain at least six feet away during the outdoor visit; and a resident who is in the parking lot under a canopy tent that only has one wall for protection from the sun or other weather where the Visitor is also under the canopy at least six feet distant.

Outdoor Visits may only occur when all listed requirements are met. Those requirements are:

- i. The visit must occur outdoors. If the weather does not permit the Outdoor Visit to occur, the Residential Facility may postpone or cancel the visit or provide one of the other forms of visitation allowed by this Order in line with all listed requirements.
- ii. In addition to symptom screening and asking other screening questions of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit as required in Section 7 below, a Residential Facility must conduct temperature screening of all Visitors participating in an Outdoor Visit.
- iii. If a Residential Facility uses a tent or other temporary structure in relation to an Outdoor Visit, the Residential Facility must follow the requirements of Health Officer Order No. C19-07h, including as that order is revised in the future. That order currently notes that operations under a tent, canopy, or other sun or weather shelter may occur only as long as no more than one side is of the structure is closed, allowing sufficient outdoor air movement.
- 6. COVID-19 Prerequisites and Outbreak Restrictions. For Allowed Visitation, there are certain prerequisites that apply to different kinds of visits, and if there is a COVID-19 outbreak at the Residential Facility, there are certain visitation restrictions that apply until the outbreak is resolved. Note that any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact the Department of Public Health Outbreak Management Group ("OMG") for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6. OMG may be reached by phone by calling 415-554-2830, selecting Option 1, and then following the prompts for Senior Care Facilities.
 - a. <u>Prerequisites</u>. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits:
 - i. No visit is allowed for any resident who has any of the COVID-19 Symptoms, is in isolation or quarantine related to COVID-19, or has a COVID-19 diagnosis; and



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

ii. There must be an absence of new COVID-19 cases or SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Residential Facility for the preceding 14 days (including residents and staff) and the Residential Facility must not be in the surveillance period for an active outbreak.

If these prerequisites are not met, then the types of visits listed in this subsection a. may not occur until the prerequisites are met.

As noted above, any Residential Facility that has multiple units or floors may contact OMG for permission to treat each unit or floor as a separate Residential Facility for purposes of this Section 6.

- b. <u>Visit-Related Outbreak Restrictions</u>. If there is reason to believe that the Residential Facility has had a new COVID-19 case or SARS-CoV-2 infection, the following restrictions apply:
 - i. For Facility Window Visits with an Open Window, Vehicle Visits with Open Windows, and Outdoor Visits, Allowed Visitation must be postponed until the requirements of Section 6.a above are met. Residential Facilities with multiple units or floors may contact OMG to determine if the Residential Facility can safely cohort to allow visitation for residents in non-outbreak units.
 - ii. For Facility Window Visits with a Closed Window and Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows, visitation may continue but each Visitor is prohibited from walking through any building of the Residential Facility.

Any Residential Facility that has questions about what constitutes an outbreak or other questions about this section may contact OMG.

7. Necessary Visitation. The term "Necessary Visitation" means a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait and that needs to occur in addition to Allowed Visitation. If the needs and context of a particular request for Necessary Visitation justifies visitation in a manner other than Allowed Visitation, then the Residential Facility Administrator may arrange for Necessary Visitation of a resident. For purposes of this Order, the Residential Facility Administrator may act through a designee. The decision about whether the needs and context justify Necessary Visitation is left to the determination of the Residential Facility Administrator, who must make the decision based on this Order and the COVID-19 Guidance. Also, any Necessary Visitation allowed under this Section must be done subject to requirements of the COVID-19 Guidance and as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Residential Facility. All Visitors allowed under this Section 6 must comply with subsections v, vii, x, xii, xiii, and xvii of the



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

General Visitation Requirements above.

- 8. <u>Visitor Screening Procedures</u>. Each Residential Facility must use the following screening procedures for all Visitors. The Residential Facility must screen each Visitor on the day of the visit before the visit in a manner consistent with current DPH guidance (which takes into account guidance from CCL and the United States **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC"))** regarding screening. At a minimum, the screening must address current or recent: actual or suspected COVID-19 diagnosis; actual or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection; actual or suspected close contact with someone with the virus; and COVID-19 Symptoms (listed below in Section 18.e) consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection, taking into account the age of the person being screened given different criteria for people under 18 years old. If a Visitor answers affirmatively to any screening question, they should, if appropriate, be referred for testing and directed to the DPH website with information about Health Officer directives on isolation and quarantine and explanatory material in multiple languages, available online at https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19. Screening may be done by phone, verbally in person ensuring at least six feet of physical distance, or using other methods such as text or email. It is up to the Residential Facility, at the discretion of the Administrator or designee, to decide which method(s) for screening work best for the context. A Residential Facility may use temperature checks consistent with DPH guidelines, and it must conduct temperature checks for Outdoor Visitation.
- 9. Other COVID-19 Related Protocols. The following sections list additional COVID-19 related protocols aimed at protecting residents, staff, and Visitors.
- 10. Non-Essential Resident Movement is Discouraged. To the maximum extent possible, each Residential Facility must discourage Non-Essential Resident Movement, as defined in Section 18.c below, onto, off of, and within Residential Facility Premises where feasible. Whenever a Residential Facility resident leaves the Residential Facility Premises, the resident is ordered to comply with Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.o of the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order. At the time this Order was issued, the Social Distancing Requirements are:
 - a. Maintaining at least six-foot social distancing from individuals who are not part of the same Household;
 - b. Frequently washing hands with soap and water for at least 20 seconds, or using hand sanitizer that is recognized by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as effective in combatting COVID-19;
 - c. Covering coughs and sneezes with a tissue or fabric or, if not possible, into the sleeve or elbow (but not into hands);



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

- d. Wearing a face covering when out in public, consistent with the orders or guidance of the Health Officer; and
- e. Avoiding all social interaction outside the Household when sick with a fever, cough, or other COVID-19 symptoms.
- 11. Face Coverings. In general, all residents, staff, and Visitors must comply with Order No. C19-12c of the Health Officer, issued on July 22, 2020 (the "Face Covering Order"), including as that order is revised in the future. Residents, staff, and Visitors must also comply with any other requirements of the Residential Facility regarding wearing a mask or Face Covering or other Personal Protective Equipment ("PPE"). In addition to the exceptions to wearing a Face Covering listed in the Face Covering Order, a Face Covering is not required for any resident who, on account of dementia, grave mental illness, fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove a Face Covering, inability to call for help, physician order, or other circumstance should not wear a Face Covering. The Residential Facility must provide a Face Covering or other mask to any resident or Visitor on request. The Face Covering Order and this Order allow Residential Facilities to require and provide coverings that offer added protection such as an isolation mask or personal protective equipment ("PPE"), as appropriate in the circumstances.
- 12. Written COVID-19 Plan Requirement. Each Residential Facility must update and continue to implement the written plan that was originally required by the prior version of this Order (the "COVID-19 Plan"). This Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has written policies or other written guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan. The Residential Facility's existing COVID-19 Plan may be used while a new version is prepared, and the COVID-19 Plan should be updated no later than September 15, 2020. The plan must comply with applicable guidance from DPH regarding the screening of patients, personnel, and visitors for signs of COVID-19 or other illnesses. The COVID-19 Plan must also address other applicable COVID-19-related guidance, including steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission by authorized Visitors and Non-Essential Persons such as through hand washing, use of Face Coverings, imposition of the Social Distancing Requirements listed in Section 8.0 of the Stay-Safe-At-Home Order, and limiting the duration of visits, as appropriate. Nothing in this Order prohibits a Residential Facility from taking steps more protective against transmission of COVID-19 than guidance provided by the CDC, CCL, and DPH in its plan. Each Residential Facility must update its COVID-19 Plan when appropriate under new COVID-19 recommendations or requirements issued by DPH or as otherwise required by law. See the COVID-19 Guidance (discussed in Section 15 below) for more information about the COVID-19 Plan.
- 13. <u>Staff Screening</u>. Each Residential Facility's COIVD-19 Plan must also include a requirement that any employee or other staff member who is sick or does not pass



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

the required screening must be immediately sent home and not return to work until they can do so safely under DPH guidance or authorized to return by a physician. If a Residential Facility is unable to immediately send home any such employee or staff member, the Residential Facility must (1) prevent that staff member from engaging in any resident care or contact (except in an emergency when the Residential Facility is doing whatever it can to protect residents) and (2) immediately notify its respective licensing entity and seek guidance from that entity.

- 14. <u>Staff and Resident Testing</u>. If a Residential Facility learns that any resident or staff member who currently resides or works at, or within the prior two weeks resided or worked at, the Residential Facility tests or has tested positive for COVID-19, then the Residential Facility must immediately (within 1 hour) notify the Department of Public Health and meet any other applicable notification requirements.
- 15. <u>COVID-19 Guidance</u>. Attached to this Order as <u>Appendix B</u> is written guidance to Residential Facilities ("COVID-19 Guidance") issued by the Health Officer. The Health Officer or designee may revise the COVID-19 Guidance in writing from time to time. Each Residential Facility must follow the COVID-19 Guidance.
- 16. Non-Compliance. If any Visitor or Non-Essential Person refuses to comply with this Order, then the Residential Facility may contact the San Francisco Police Department to request assistance in enforcing this Order. The Residential Facility shall take whatever steps are possible within the bounds of the law to protect residents from any such Visitor or person who refuses to comply with this Order. For example, a Residential Facility should contact facility security and ask the unauthorized visitor or person to comply with conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility. Even if a Visitor or Non-Essential Person otherwise complies with the facility's visitation protocols as outlined in this paragraph, they are still in violation of this Order if their presence is not an Allowed Visitation or Necessary Visitation under this Order.
- 17. No Restriction on First Responders, Others. This Order does not restrict first responder access to Residential Facility Premises during an emergency. Further, this Order does not restrict local, state, or federal officers, investigators, or medical or law enforcement personnel from carrying out their lawful duties on Residential Facility Premises. Persons other than first responders allowed access under this paragraph must comply with all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Residential Facility Premises when feasible.
- 18. <u>Definitions</u>: For the purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below:
 - a. "Visitors" are people who come onsite to a Residential Facility to meet with a resident who are not staff of the facility. This term includes family members



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

and loved ones of residents and those who have legal authority to make healthcare or other legal decisions for a resident. The Ombudsperson is an authorized visitor and is <u>not</u> included in this term, but the Ombudsperson must still follow all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility and should also try to avoid non-essential visits.

- b. "Non-Essential Personnel" are employees, contractors, volunteers, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. Refer to the COVID-19 Guidance for more information. Nothing in this Order prohibits a resident from seeking care at any Residential Facility or at any clinic or other location providing health care or other services on the Residential Facility's Premises.
- c. "Non-Essential Resident Movement" means travel off, onto, or within the Residential Facility's Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes as described more fully in the COVID-19 Guidance.
- d. "Premises" includes without limitation the buildings, grounds, facilities, driveways, parking areas, and public spaces within the legal boundaries of each Residential Facility listed in Section 20 below.
- e. "COVID-19 Symptom" means a symptom consistent with SARS-CoV-2 infection. At the time this Order is issued, that list includes for individuals 18 years or older any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); cough; sore throat; shortness of breath; chills; headache; body aches; fatigue; loss of smell or taste; diarrhea; runny nose; nasal congestion; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19. For those younger than 18 years, "COVID-19 Symptom" means any of the following symptoms which is not explained by another condition or diagnosis: temperature greater than 100.4F (38.0C); sore throat; new uncontrolled cough that causes difficulty breathing (for youth with chronic allergic/asthmatic cough, a change in their cough from baseline); diarrhea, vomiting, or abdominal pain; new onset of severe headache, especially with a fever; or other symptoms if there is associated clinical concern for COVID-19.
- 19. <u>Licensing Entity Notification</u>. Each Residential Facility must within 12 hours of receipt of this Order notify its respective licensing entity (whether the California Department of Public Health or otherwise) of the existence of this Order regarding the Residential Facility. And as noted in Section 5 above, if a facility is unable to offer any form of Allowed Visitation (other than temporarily based on short-term staffing or other conditions), it must notify CCL with an explanation of why it is

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

unable to offer such visitation.

20. <u>List of Residential Facilities</u>. This Order applies to each facility listed below (each a Residential Facility):

Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly:

Facility Name	Facility Address	Zip
9TH AVENUE COMMUNITY CARE HOME	1730 - 9TH AVENUE	94122
ALMA VIA OF SAN FRANCISCO	ONE THOMAS MORE WAY	94132
AUTUMN GLOW	654 GROVE STREET	94102
BESTUDIO'S CARE HOME FOR THE ELDERLY	51 DE LONG STREET	94112
BUENA VISTA MANOR HOUSE	399 BUENA VISTA EAST	94117
BYXBEE HOME	383 BYXBEE STREET	94132
CARE AND CARE RESIDENCE I	940 HAIGHT STREET	94117
CARE AND CARE RESIDENCE II	901 GRAFTON AVENUE	94112
CARLISLE, THE	1450 POST ST	94109
CAYCO'S CARE HOME	1855 35TH AVENUE	94122
CORINTHIAN GARDEN RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	170 APTOS AVENUE	94127
COVENTRY PLACE	1550 SUTTER STREET	94109
CYPRESS AT GOLDEN GATE	1601 19TH AVENUE	94122
DAMENIK'S HOME	331 30TH AVENUE	94121
FOOK HONG SF CARE HOME, INC.	5735 MISSION STREET	94112
GOLDEN RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	166 FOOTE AVENUE	94112
GONZALES HOME	2237 NORIEGA STREET	94122
GUIROLA RESIDENT CARE	618 HOLLOWAY AVENUE	94112
HAYES VALLEY CARE	601 LAGUNA ST	94102
IDA'S REST HOME, LLC	612 39TH AVENUE	94121
JANET'S RESIDENTIAL FACILITY FOR THE ELDERLY	2970 25TH AVENUE	94132
JULIE'S CARE HOME	1363 - 5TH AVENUE	94122
KIMOCHI HOME	1531 SUTTER STREET	94109

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

KOKORO ASSISTED LIVING	1881 BUSH ST	94109
LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP RFE #1	476 FAIR OAKS	94110
LINA'S REST HOME I	STREET 393 SILVER AVENUE	94112
LYNNE & ROY M. FRANK RESIDENCES	ONE AVALON	94112
	AVENUE) .11 2
MARIAN'S CARE HOME I	1450 - 24TH AVENUE	94122
MERCED GIRARD RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	129 GIRARD STREET	94134
MERCED RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	259 BROAD STREET	94112
MERCED THREE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	1420 HAMPSHIRE STREET	94110
MERCED TWO RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	257 BROAD STREET	94112
PARKSIDE RETIREMENT HOME	2447 - 19TH AVENUE	94116
PORTOLA GARDENS	350 UNIVERSITY ST	94134
PROVIDENCE PLACE	2456 GEARY BLVD.	94115
PSALM RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	565 GROVE ST	94102
QUALITY CARE HOMES, LLC 1	801 - 38TH AVENUE	94121
QUALITY CARE HOMES, LLC 2	757 - 44TH AVENUE	94121
QUALITY CARE HOMES, LLC 3	2277 - 33RD AVENUE	94116
QUALITY CARE HOMES, LLC 4	475 EUCALYPTUS DRIVE	94132
RHODA GOLDMAN PLAZA	2180 POST STREET	94115
RJ STARLIGHT HOME CORPORATION	2680 BRYANT STREET	94110
SAGEBROOK SENIOR LIVING AT SAN	2750 GEARY BLVD	94118
FRANCISCO		
SAN FRANCISCO RCFE	887 POTRERO AVENUE	94110
SANTIAGO HOME CARE	152 HAROLD STREET	94112
SFAL - THE AVENUE	1035 VAN NESS AVENUE	94109
STELLA'S CARE HOME I	616 39TH AVENUE	94121
ST. ANNE'S HOME FOR THE AGED	300 LAKE STREET	94118
ST. FRANCIS MANOR I	1450 PORTOLA DRIVE	94127
SUNSET CARE HOME	1434 7TH AVENUE	94122
SUNSET CARE HOME 2	1367 39TH AVENUE	94122
SUNSET GARDENS	1338 27TH AVENUE	94122
SUTRO HEIGHTS RESIDENTIAL CARE, LLC	659 45TH AVENUE	94121

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

TARAVAL RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	3721 TARAVAL	94116
	STREET	,
TIFFANY'S CARE HOME, INC	50 TIFFANY AVENUE	94110
TLC HOME CARE II	110 VALE AVENUE	94132
VICTORIAN MANOR	1444 MCALLISTER	94115
	STREET	
VILLAGE AT HAYES VALLEY-GROVE	601 LAGUNA	94102
BUILDING, THE	STREET	
VILLAGE AT HAYES VALLEY-LAGUNA	624 LAGUNA ST	94102
BUILDING, THE		

Adult Residential Facilities:

Facility Name	Facility Address	Zip
AMB RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	219 LONDON STREET	94112
ARDOIN, DAVID RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	126 MONTANA	94112
	STREET	
AURORA'S RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	1823 SILLIMAN	94134
	STREET	
AURORA'S RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	1821 SILLIMAN	94134
	STREET	
AURORA'S RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	1827 SILLIMAN	94134
DEDIVA DETTE SI STEVIS DO ADD A SADE MONE.	STREET	0.410.4
BERNADETTE SMITH'S BOARD & CARE HOME	1648 REVERE STREET	94124
#2 BMB SUNSHINE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	1257 FILL TON CTREET	04117
	1356 FULTON STREET	94117
BRODERICK STREET ADULT RESIDENTIAL	1421 BRODERICK	94115
FACILITY CROSSROADS RESIDENTIAL CARE	STREET	04112
CROSSROADS RESIDENTIAL CARE	9 CRYSTAL STREET	94112
CRYSTAL HOME CARE	1 CRYSTAL STREET	94112
DAVID ARDOIN 2	1582 VAN DYKE	94124
	AVENUE	
DIAMOND LODGE	20 ARLINGTON	94131
EL CER A L P CREENIG A RE	STREET	0.4100
EMERALDGREEN'S ARF	851 HEAD STREET	94123
FAIRBANKS RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	46 WILLIAMS	94124
	AVENUE	
FLOR'S RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	301 EDINBURGH	94112
ED ANGIG REGIDENTIAL GARETIONS	STREET	0.411.0
FRANCIS RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	45 FRANCIS	94112
HOLLY PARK FAMILY HOME, INC.	321 HOLLY PARK	94110
	CIRCLE	

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

J & L ADULT RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	1596 ALEMANY BLVD	94112
KONANIA HOUSE	226 FARALLONES STREET	94112
LIFE CONNECTION - PORTOLA HOME	1340 PORTOLA DRIVE	94127
MAE BEA ANDREWS BOARDING CARE	1691 NEWCOMB AVE	94124
MAE BEA ANDREWS BOARDING CARE	1739 NEWCOMB AVE	94124
MERIT RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME INC.	162 MONTANA ST.	94112
MYNARR HOME	90 LIEBIG STREET	94112
NANIOLA RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME I	41 PRETOR WAY	94112
NANIOLA RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME III	506 PANORAMA DRIVE	94131
NANIOLA RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME IV	798-A HURON AVENUE	94112
ODYSSEY HOUSE	484 OAK STREET	94102
PARKVIEW INN #1	969 BUENA VISTA WEST	94117
PARKVIEW INN #2	935 BUENA VISTA WEST	94117
POMEROY RECREATION & REHABILITATION CENTER	2626 FULTON ST	94118
POMEROY RECREATION & REHABILITATION CENTER	207 SKYLINE BLVD	94132
POMEROY RECREATION & REHABILITATION CENTER 2	2750 FULTON ST	94118
RUSTAN ADULT RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME	460 UTAH STREET	94110
SAN FRANCISCO ADULT RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	887 POTRERO AVE.	94110
SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL FACILITY	627 CAMBRIDGE STREET	94134
SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL FACILITY (A)	1226 GOETTINGEN STREET	94134
SF WOMEN'S REHAB FOUNDATION DBA STEPPING STONE	255 10TH AVE	94118
SOUTH VAN NESS MANOR	822 SOUTH VAN NESS	94110
SUNBODY HAVEN	198 PEABODY	94134
SUNBODY HAVEN 2	1125 GENEVA STREET	94112
UNITED FAMILY CARE HOME	165 GUERRERO STREET	94103
VERNON MANOR	425 VERNON STREET	94132

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

Residential Facilities for the Chronically Ill:

Facility Name	Facility Address	<u>Zip</u>
ASSISTED CARE	129 HYDE STREET	94102
CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CTR COMING	115 DIAMOND	94114
HOME HOSPICE	STREET	
LELAND AVENUE PROJECT	141 LELAND AVENUE	94134
MAITRI RESIDENTIAL CARE (FPLWA)	401 DUBOCE	94117
	AVENUE	
PETER CLAVER COMMUNITY	1340 GOLDEN GATE	94115
	AVENUE	
RICHARD M. COHEN RESIDENCE	220 DOLORES	94103
	STREET	

- 21. Complaints. A Residential Facility resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative may contact a representative of the Residential Facility to seek clarification of any part of this Order by contacting the Administrator of the facility. If a resident or the resident's authorized lawful representative objects to the appropriateness of the limitation of access contained in this Order, the resident or lawful authorized representative must first raise their concern with the Residential Facility at issue. The Residential Facility is ordered to respond to the concern within 2 business days.
- 22. Continuing Severe Health and Safety Risk Posed by COVID-19. This Order is issued based on the need for continued protection of all Residential Facility Visitors, residents, and staff in the City. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Residents at Residential Facilities are among the most vulnerable and most likely to face serious outcomes, including death, from infection by SARS-CoV-2. There are currently only limited treatments and not approved vaccine for COVID-19, and there is a high risk of infection from asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people who have the virus. Due to the length of time during which people with the virus can unknowingly infect others, it is imperative that all appropriate steps be taken to protect residents and staff who deal with residents from infection. Limiting visitors and requiring the other safety protections included in this Order will thereby slow virus transmission as much as possible in order to protect the most vulnerable, prevent infections and serious illness and death, and prevent the healthcare system from being overwhelmed.
- 23. <u>Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths</u>. As of September 1, 2020, there are 9,755 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the City (up from 37 on March 16, 2020, the day before the first shelter-in-place order in the City went into effect) as well as at least 84 deaths (up from 1 death on March 17, 2020). This information, as well as



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

information regarding hospitalizations and hospital capacity, is regularly updated on the San Francisco Department of Public Health's website at https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/fjki-2fab.

- 24. <u>Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and State Health</u> Orders.
 - a. State and Local Emergency Proclamations. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency issued by Mayor London Breed, as supplemented on March 11, 2020, the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health, as each of them have been and may be supplemented.
 - b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the March 19, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer (the "State Shelter Order"), which set baseline statewide restrictions on non-residential Business activities, effective until further notice, the Governor's March 19, 2020 Executive Order N-33-20 directing California residents to follow the State Shelter Order, and the July 13, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer. The May 4, 2020 Executive Order issued by Governor Newsom and May 7, 2020 Order of the State Public Health Officer permit certain Businesses to reopen if a local health officer believes the conditions in that jurisdictions warrant it, but expressly acknowledge the authority of local health officers to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer. Also on June 18, 2020, the State Department of Public Health issued guidance for the use of face coverings, requiring all people in the State to wear face coverings in certain high-risk situations, subject to limited exceptions.
- 25. <u>Effective Date</u>. This Order becomes effective at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 5, 2020, and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Effective as of 9 a.m. on September 5, 2020, this Order revises and replaces Health Officer Order No. C19-09, issued March 18, 2020.
- 26. <u>Reporting Violations</u>. Any person who believes this Order is being violated may contact 3-1-1 or go to <u>www.sf.gov/report-health-order-violation</u> to provide



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-09b

information about the alleged violation.

27. Copies and Notice. Each Residential Facility must promptly provide notice of this Order as follows: (1) by posting this Order on the Residential Facility website (if any); (2) by posting this Order at all entrances to the Residential Facility; (3) by providing a summary of this Order to each Residential Facility resident, indicating how the resident can obtain a full copy; (4) by providing a summary of this Order to any authorized decision maker for each Residential Facility resident if not the resident, including any conservator, indicating how the decision maker can obtain a full copy; (5) by providing this Order to the Residential Facility Ombudsperson (if any); and (6) by giving a copy to anyone who visits the Residential Facility or who contacts the Residential Facility seeking to visit.

The City must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the Department of Public Health website at www.sfdph.org/healthorders; (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

- 28. <u>Severability</u>. If any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other people or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.
- 29. <u>Interpretation</u>. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the intent of this Order as described in Section 1 above. The summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order; in the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in this Order.

Date: September 4, 2020

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,

Health Officer of the

City and County of San Francisco

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

Note: This document provides a summary for convenience of the requirements for Allowed Visitation under Section 5 of the Order. Each Residential Facility must comply with all requirements of the Order, regardless of what is listed below.

FACILITY VISITATION PREREQUISITES					
VISITATION TYPE	PREREQUISITES				
Outdoor Visits	1.No visitation for residents with symptoms, in isolation or COVID+ and quarantine				
Facility Window Visits with an Open Window	2. Absence of any new COVID-19 cases in the facility for 14 days, either				
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows	residents or staff, AND not currently in the surveillance period for an active outbreak				
Facility Window Visit with a Closed					
Window /	Visitor(s) do not walk through the facility				
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility	(Note that items 1. and 2. above do not apply for closed-window visits)				
Windows					

In the event of a new COVID-19 case at the facility, take the following actions until the following visitation prerequisites are met:				
VISITATION TYPE	ACTION			
Outdoor Visits	Suspend/Postpone			
Facility Window Visits with an Open Window	For facilities with multiple units/floors, contact the DPH / OMG¹ to determine if the facility can safely cohort to allow visitation for residents in non-outbreak units.			
Vehicle Visits with Open Windows				
Facility Window Visit with a Closed				
Window /	Allow as long as the visitor(s) do not walk through the facility			
Vehicle Visits with Closed Facility Windows				

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Outdoor Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS			
Outdoor Visits	☐ Visits must be supervised by facility staff at all times.			
	☐ Visitation in outdoor settings only.			
Definition: Visitor and	 If weather does not permit, provide window or vehicle visits. 			
Resident are both in an	☐ Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours.			
outdoor setting	☐ Visitor(s) must wear masks. Residents must wear masks or other face coverings (as tolerated). ²			
	G-feet or more physical distancing (no physical touching between resident and visitor such as hugging, hand-shaking, etc.) It is the facility's responsibility to monitor and ensure compliance. It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(s) groups from being too close to each other.			
	□ No more than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are from different households, the group should be limited to 2 visitors. Visitation group size can be determined based on facility space to allow for proper distancing and safety.			
	☐ Visitation by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If children are allowed to visit, all visitors ages 2+ should wear a face covering, and children must be under supervision at all times. Screening should take into account age-specific symptoms.			
	 Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues and conduct temperature check prior to visit. 			
	 Perform hand hygiene in accordance with CDC guidelines (provide supplies as needed). 			
	☐ Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.			
	☐ Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.			
	☐ Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules.			
	Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitors walking through the facility or walking the shortest route through the facility.			

Appendix A – Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Facility Window Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS	
For All window visits:	Visits must be supervised by facility staff at all times	
	☐ Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours.	
	No more than 4 visitors from the same household. If visitors are from different	
	households, the group should be limited to 2 visitors. Visitation group size can be	e
	determined based on facility space to allow for proper distancing and safety.	
	☐ Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit.	
	Facility should have a phone available to speak to resident at a safe distance.	
	☐ If the resident must be taken to any of the designated areas, the resident must	
	wear a mask (as tolerated) ² for that journey.	
	☐ Whenever possible, visitation should take place without visitor(s) walking through	gh
	the facility or walking the shortest route through the facility.	
	☐ Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is no	
	permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved	
	facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfect	tion
	and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.	
	☐ Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.	
	☐ Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate	
	residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules.	
	☐ Visitation by children is left to the discretion of the facility. If children are allowed	
	to visit, all visitors ages 2+ should wear a face covering, and children must be und	
	supervision at all times. Screening should take into account age-specific sympton	ms.
Facility Window Visits	☐ Resident must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask (as	
with an Open Window	tolerated). ²	
	☐ Visitor(s) must stay at least 3 feet back from the window and wear a mask.	
Definition : Visitor and Resident are separated by	Facility should ensure that visitors seeing different residents can also keep at lea	ist 6
and open window with the	feet apart (limit crowding) and farther if needed so people can hear without	۵)
Resident on the Facility side	shouting. It is required to put up signs and clearly mark areas to prevent visitor(signoups from being too close to each other.	5)
of a window and Visitor(s)	groups from being too close to each other.	
outside on the other side Facility Window Visit	☐ If the visitor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the visitor(s) must	t
with a Closed Window	wear masks.	-
	wear masks.	
Definition : Visitor and		
Resident are separated by a		
Window. At all times, the		
facility window must remain closed so no air flow is		
exchanged		

Appendix A - Allowed Visitation Summary

For <u>Vehicle Visits</u>, facilities must comply with the following parameters:

VISITATION TYPE	PARAMETERS
For All Vehicle Visits:	 □ Visits to be supervised by facility staff at all times. □ Visits must be scheduled in advance; facility can determine visiting hours. □ Screen visitors for symptoms and related issues prior to visit. □ Facility should have a phone available to speak to resident at a safe distance.
	If the resident must be taken to any of the designated areas, the resident must wear a mask (as tolerated)* for that journey.
	Sharing items, including food, drinks, or utensils, during any in-person visits is not permitted. If gifts are permitted under a separate policy, they must be approved by facility staff and processed by facility staff, providing an opportunity for disinfection and sanitization. Items or gifts may not be exchanged directly during the visit.
	Routinely clean and disinfect all frequently touched surfaces.
	Visits must not exceed 1 hour and may be shorter if needed to accommodate
	residents while assuring compliance with visitation rules.
Vehicle Visits with	☐ Resident should stay at least 6 feet back from the vehicle window and wear a mask
Open Windows	(as tolerated). ²
- 6 to	Visitor(s) must wear a mask.
Definition : Visitor(s), in a vehicle, and Resident are separated by at least 6 feet	If there is a pull-in area for vehicle visits, the visits must be scheduled to prevent crowding and keep at least 6 feet between residents.
of distance where the Resident is in either an outdoor space or in the Facility behind an open window	☐ To reduce air flow to the resident, if possible, keep vehicle's window closest to the resident closed.
Vehicle Visits with	☐ If the visitor(s) is in an area were other people will be passing, the visitor(s) must
Closed Facility Windows	wear masks in the vehicle.
Definition: Visitor(s), in a vehicle, and Resident are separated by a Closed Facility Window. At all times, the facility window must remain closed so no air flow is exchanged.	

¹ Contact DPH Outbreak Management Group (OMG) with any specific questions for their sites and guidance. Call 415-554-2830, select Option 1, and then follow the prompts for Senior Care Facilities. See Section 6 of the Order for details.

² Requirements for masks or face coverings are relaxed for residents as follows and for related/similar issues: a diagnosis of dementia or grave mental illness; fear of/concern for suffocation, inability to remove or call for help <u>OR</u> ordered by physician. See Section 11 of the Order for details.



APPENDIX B: WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-09b

DATE ORDER ISSUED: September 4, 2020

This information (the "COVID-19 Guidance") is meant to help each Residential Facility when implementing the Order to which it is attached. This document uses the terms defined in the Order.

- 1. For purposes of the Order, the term "Administrator" means the administrator of a Residential Facility or the administrator's designee.
- 2. The Order does not prohibit a Residential Facility from being more restrictive in its operations and practices than is outlined in the Order. The Order also does not require allowing visitation when not otherwise required by applicable laws or regulations.
- 3. Guidance regarding Section 12 (the COVID-19 Plan): The Order requires the Residential Facility to create a COVID-19 Plan that addresses issues including: 1) screening of residents, staff, and Visitors for COVID-19 Symptoms or other illness; 2) conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises for authorized visitors that reduce the risk of infection, such as thorough hand washing, appropriate use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), maintaining at least six feet distance from other people, and limiting the duration of visits, as appropriate; 3) sending sick employees home immediately; 4) notifying DPH and other regulators of any positive SARS-CoV-2 result for a resident or staff member, including as required by law; and 5) other CDC or CCL requirements. Note that the Order does not require a Residential Facility to create any new documentation if it already has policies or other guidance that address the requirements for the COVID-19 Plan.

The COVID-19 Plan should also address how the facility can reduce the risk of unnecessary exposure as outlined in the San Francisco Department of Public Health Social Distancing Protocol, attached as Appendix A to Health Officer Order No. C19-07h (or as that order is revised in the future). For example, the facility should avoid large inperson gatherings of residents or staff, instead holding smaller gatherings that still meet the facility's mission and needs (*e.g.*, substituting unit-based activities for a facility-wide bingo event). Similarly, postponing large staff meetings or having meetings occur by phone can help when feasible.

Additionally, there may be areas that warrant limitations that are not normally in place. A Residential Facility may have a cafeteria or other concession that is normally available to residents, essential employees, other employees (such as others who share the building but are not associated with the healthcare mission of the facility), and Visitors. While this Order is in effect, the Residential Facility should consider whether a restriction on such use makes sense. One option might be to limit cafeteria visits to residents and essential staff and temporarily block other employees and Visitors from that area.



WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-09b

If the facility had plans to have vendors come onsite for meetings or to show sample products, those meetings should be conducted via remote communication, occur at another site that does not include a vulnerable population, or be postponed until after this emergency situation if possible.

- 4. Guidance regarding Section 4 (efforts to facilitate contact that is not in-person): The Order requires the Residential Facility to make reasonable efforts to facilitate contact that is not in person between a Visitor or Non-Essential Personnel and a resident. Such efforts include using technology to facilitate a remote connection with the resident when possible and would include telephone calls, telephone conferences involving multiple people, and video conferences using appropriate technology. Efforts are not reasonable if they interfere with the Residential Facility's healthcare mission or if they are not available or are cost prohibitive. The Residential Facility is encouraged to be creative in trying to facilitate contact that is not in-person so long as it complies with its other legal and regulatory obligations.
- 5. Guidance regarding Section 7 (Necessary Visitation): The term Necessary Visitation refers to a visit or contact that is based on urgent health, legal, or other issues that cannot wait until later. Nothing in the Order limits the standard healthcare that the Residential Facility provides to a resident. When medical care is appropriate or required, it is by definition permitted under the Order. Necessary Visitation refers to other types of visits or contact that are time-sensitive or critical. For example, a resident may be in the end stages of life. In that instance, family or loved ones should be allowed to be with the resident unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission in light of the current emergency, such as during a serious outbreak of cases. Another example would be a resident who is updating their will or other legal papers and an in-person meeting with the lawyer or family members or a notary is required, again unless doing so would interfere with the Residential Facility's mission. But, a meeting with a lawyer to discuss future changes or other, non-urgent issues should generally be postponed or conducted via telephone or other means.

Anyone who is legally authorized to make decisions for the resident, whether by operation of a durable power of attorney or public or private conservatorship, must be given special consideration, especially if they need to meet in person with the resident to fulfill their role. This distinction is in place because decisions regarding care when there is a surrogate decision maker should not be delayed when in-person contact is needed, whereas visits by other family or loved ones are important but may not be time-sensitive. But such authorized decision-makers should be encouraged to use alternative methods of contacting the resident when possible in order to avoid exposing the resident and others.

Also, Necessary Visitation should <u>not</u> be granted for routine visits by decision makers, family, or loved ones, even if the resident very much looks forward to the visit or the visitor has a strong desire for the visit. Such routine visits put all residents at risk at this

WRITTEN GUIDANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH OFFICER ORDER No. C19-09b

time and may only occur as Allowed Visitation. But if a family member or loved one plays an essential role in providing care to a resident, without which the resident will suffer medical or clinical harm, Necessary Visitation may be appropriate.

There may be other unique situations that justify a Necessary Visitation based on the context. And as the situation evolves, the Residential Facility may need to restrict Necessary Visitation. This Order is intended to give the Administrator flexibility in making that determination so long as the decision is in line with the Order and this COVID-19 Guidance. The Administrator should not authorize Necessary Visitation for all or a majority of residents as that would likely reflect a violation of the intent of the Order to protect all residents from the risks of non-essential exposure to COVID-19.

All visits allowed as Necessary Visitation must occur subject to all conditions of visitation imposed by the Residential Facility at the time of entry or access to the Premises.

- 6. Guidance regarding Sections 3 and 18.b (Non-Essential Personnel): The Order defines Non-Essential Personnel as employees, contractors, or others who provide services onsite at a Residential Facility but who do not perform treatment, maintenance, support, or administrative tasks deemed essential to the healthcare mission of the Residential Facility. This term also includes employees of the Residential Facility or its vendors (and their employees) who are not needed in the short term for the facility to perform its healthcare mission. For example, a vendor that makes deliveries of large bottled water refill jugs is likely not essential. However, the facility should work to see if there are ways to permit delivery, such as on a loading dock, which would eliminate the need in the short term for someone to make visits all across the facility. This Order grants the Administrator authority to make judgment calls about how best to ensure the facility is able to operate during this emergency situation.
- 7. Guidance regarding Section 18.c (Non-Essential Resident Movement): The Order defines Non-Essential Resident Movement as travel off or onto Residential Facility Premises by a resident other than for specific treatment or pressing legal purposes. This is contrasted with situations when a resident leaves the facility for health-related purposes or as required by law, such as for a meeting or service mandated by a court. The goal of the Order is to encourage residents to limit Non-Essential Resident Movement.

* * *

Dated: September 4, 2020

From: San Francisco Controller"s Office Reports

To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

Subject: Issued: Whistleblower Program Annual Report and Quarter 4 Results, Fiscal Year 2019-20

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 11:58:01 AM

Office of the Controller

City Services Auditor



Report Issued

The Controller's Office works to ensure the City's financial integrity and to promote efficient, effective, and accountable government. As part of our responsibility to ensure good governance, we administer the City's Whistleblower Program, which responds to specific allegations of administrative wrongdoing by city employees and those who do business with the City. Also this year, in response to the federal criminal charges filed against former Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, the Controller's Office and City Attorney's Office began a joint public corruption investigation and opened a Public Integrity Tip Line on February 4th to gather information specific to the investigation.

These programs are critical to helping combat waste, corruption, fraud, abuse, and violations of policies and regulations. And importantly, they have real and consequential roles as entry points for citizen complaints to bring offenders to justice and recoup ill-gotten gains.

We just issued the City's Annual Whistleblower Report, which covers July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

Download the full report

We encourage city staff, contractors working on behalf of taxpayers, and all San Franciscans to learn more about the Whistleblower Program and increase or refresh their knowledge about red flags that may indicate unethical conduct, along with the secure ways they can report it.

Helpful Resources

- Whistleblower Program Home Page
- Definitions and Red Flags
- Printable Outreach Materials
- How to File a Complaint
- Past Webinars



Sign up to receive news and updates

This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Acting Director of Audits Mark de la Rosa at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7574, or the Audits Division at (415) 554-7469.

For media queries, please contact Communications Manager Alyssa Sewlal at <u>alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org</u> or (415) 957-2211.




Share this email:



1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place	
San Francisco, CA 94102 US	
This email was sent to eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org. To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.	

Whistleblower Program Annual Report and Quarter 4 Results

July 1, 2019, Through June 30, 2020



About the Audits Division

The City Services Auditor (CSA) was created in the Office of the Controller through an amendment to the San Francisco Charter that was approved by voters in November 2003. Within CSA, the Audits Division ensures the City's financial integrity and promotes efficient, effective, and accountable government by:

- Conducting performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and business processes.
- Investigating reports received through its whistleblower hotline of fraud, waste, and abuse of city resources.
- Providing actionable recommendations to city leaders to promote and enhance accountability and improve the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

Whistleblower Program Team:

Dave Jensen, Supervising Investigator Eryl Karr, Senior Investigator Steven Muñoz, Senior Investigator Matthew Thomas, Acting Senior Investigator Tiffany Wong, Senior Investigator William Zhou, Acting Senior Investigator

For more information please contact:

Mark de la Rosa Acting Director of Audits Office of the Controller City and County of San Francisco (415) 554-7574



http://sfcontroller.org/whistleblower-program



http://www.sfcontroller.org



@sfcontroller



in https://www.linkedin.com/company/sfaudits/

Whistleblower Program Authority

CSA conducts investigations under the authority of the San Francisco Charter, Appendix F, which requires that CSA receive individual complaints concerning the quality and delivery of government services, wasteful and inefficient city government practices, the misuse of city government funds, and improper activities by city government officers and employees.

Executive Summary

INVESTIGATION HIGHLIGHTS

The Whistleblower Program received 99 new reports in Quarter 4, bringing the fiscal year 2019-20 total to 599 reports received.

- The 99 reports received in Quarter 4 is the lowest quarterly total in this fiscal year and is 34 percent less than the number of reports received in the same quarter last fiscal year.
- The Whistleblower Program has received more reports each year since fiscal year 2012-13.

The Whistleblower Program closed 585 reports in fiscal year 2019-20 and did so in an average of 64 days.

- The program closed 464 (79 percent) of the 585 reports within 90 days of receipt.
- Of the 585 reports closed, more than half (318, or 54 percent) reached closure after an investigation.
- Of the 318 investigations closed, 106 (33 percent) resulted in a department taking a corrective or preventive action.
- The Whistleblower Program substantiated a diverse and complex set of allegations, including
 those concerning an employee inappropriately installing a camera in the workplace, unreported
 secondary employment, misuse of work resources for personal purposes, falsification of time
 and attendance records, and management ignoring complaints about falsification of time and
 attendance records.

To continue to manage the sustained, high number of reports received, the program has a multidisciplinary Controller's Office team, along with a coordinated referral and follow-up process with the City Attorney, District Attorney, Ethics Commission, and others with jurisdictional oversight, that collectively possesses the experience and expertise to address the diverse range of allegations received.

PUBLIC INTEGRITY TIP LINE

In response to the federal criminal charges filed against former Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, which were made public on January 28, 2020, the Controller's Office and City Attorney's Office began a joint public corruption investigation and opened a Public Integrity Tip Line (Tip Line) on February 4th to gather information specific to the investigation. The Tip Line received seven tips from April 1st through June 30th. Also, the Controller's Office, in cooperation with the City Attorney's Office, instituted additional controls and reviews of Public Works contracts, purchase orders, and grants for red flags and process failures. On June 29th the Controller's Office issued "Public Integrity Review: Preliminary Assessment of San Francisco Public Works Contracting."

FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION HIGHLIGHTS

The Whistleblower Program revised its outreach and education materials to reflect expanded whistleblower protections for city employees and city contractors. The program is collaborating with the Department of Human Resources and Ethics Commission in an effort to publicize the expanded protections and distribute the materials, which has been delayed due to the COVID-19 emergency.

During fiscal year 2019-20 the Whistleblower Program hosted two webinars to promote leading fraud hotline operational practices and effective investigation techniques to jurisdictions throughout the United States. The first webinar, presented in November 2019, was "Guarding Credibility: Maintaining Objectivity in Government Oversight Agencies." The second webinar, presented in June 2020, was "Using Root Cause Analysis to Enhance Your Anti-Fraud and Ethics Process."

Table of Contents


Executive Summary	3
Table of Contents	5
Fiscal Year 2019-20 – Key Statistics	6
Report Volume	6
Report Intake Channel	9
Report Closure Time	10
Disposition of Closed Reports	11
Reports Investigated and Closed, By Department	12
Report Outcomes	13
Reports Referred to Other Jurisdictions	15
Reports Open on June 30, 2020	16
Whistleblower Retaliation	17
Public Integrity Tip Line	18
Investigation Results	19
Summary of All Investigations Resulting in Corrective or Preventive Action in Quarter 4	19
File a Whistleblower Report	25
Whistleblower Program Contact Information	25
File a Public Integrity Tip	25

Fiscal Year 2019-20 – Key Statistics

REPORT VOLUME


The Whistleblower Program received 599 new reports in fiscal year 2019-20, a 19 percent increase from the previous fiscal year. Exhibit 1 summarizes the program's receipt of new reports, by quarter, since fiscal year 2012-13.

Exhibit 1: Reports Received by Quarter



The Whistleblower Program has received more reports each year since fiscal year 2012-13. The rising number of reports received in recent years cannot be attributed to just one factor. To continue to manage the sustained, high number of reports received, the program has a multidisciplinary Controller's Office team, along with a coordinated referral and follow-up process with the City Attorney, District Attorney, Ethics Commission, and others with jurisdictional oversight, that collectively possesses the experience and expertise to address the diverse range of allegations received.






^{*} Includes reports received about departments with fewer than 200 authorized FTE positions. The names of these departments are excluded from this table to protect the confidentiality of those who reported.¹

¹ The City had 37,907 authorized FTE positions in fiscal year 2019-20 (City and County of San Francisco, Salary Ordinance for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2020, and Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2021).

The Whistleblower Program reviews the number of reports received by each department and takes note of departments that receive a higher percentage of reports compared to their share of the workforce. Indicators such as this may cause the Whistleblower Program to consider further review and engage with the department through additional outreach and education.

Further, the Whistleblower Program also considers multiyear complaint trends in its outreach and education strategy to departments. For example, Exhibit 3 shows the total number of complaints received by departments over the last two fiscal years.

Exhibit 3: Reports Received in Fiscal Year 2018-19 and 2019-20, by Department*



^{*}Includes reports received about departments with fewer than 200 authorized FTE positions. The names of these departments are excluded from this table to protect the confidentiality of those who reported.

REPORT INTAKE CHANNEL

Of the 599 reports filed in fiscal year 2019-20, over three-quarters (492, or 82 percent) came through the Whistleblower Program's website. The Whistleblower Program is available to anyone, including employees of the City and County of San Francisco (City). Multiple intake channels ensure the program is readily accessible to potential reporters and available to them in a manner with which they are comfortable. The majority (400, or 67 percent) of reporters filed their reports anonymously.

Exhibit 4 summarizes reporters' use of various channels to file reports with the Whistleblower Program.

Exhibit 4: 492 of the 599 Reports Received in Fiscal Year 2019-20 Came Through the Website

Channel	Report	s Filed	Reports Filed	Anonymously
Online	492	82.14%	359	59.93%
Mail	35	5.84%	26	4.34%
E-mail	44	7.35%	5	0.83%
Phone	19	3.17%	6	1.00%
Other (Fax and Walk-In)	9	1.50%	4	0.67%
Total	599	100.00%	400	66.80%

Regardless of the reporting channel used, each report is assigned a unique tracking number and is systematically reviewed so it can be resolved as efficiently and effectively as possible. Having the Whistleblower Program as the City's central point for report intake and coordinated referral helps ensure issues and risk trends are identified, assigned, and investigated in a timely manner, so that city management can address them.

REPORT CLOSURE TIME

The Whistleblower Program closed 585 reports in fiscal year 2019-20 and did so in an average of 64 days. The program closed 464 (79 percent) of the 585 reports within 90 days of receipt, nearly achieving its goal to close at least 80 percent of all reports within 90 days. Exhibit 5 shows the age of reports that were closed in fiscal year 2019-20.




Exhibit 5: 79 Percent of Reports Closed in Fiscal Year 2019-20 Were Closed Within 90 Days

If reports are not resolved in a timely manner, reporters may conclude that their allegations are not taken seriously. However, there are several factors that can influence report closure time, including:

- The complexity of the report's allegations.
- The number of allegations made in the report.
- The availability of corroborating witnesses and evidence.

The Whistleblower Program uses a co-sourced investigation model to resolve reports.

Whistleblower Program staff in the Controller's Office leads certain investigations, whereas others may be referred to another city department involved in the allegation or with jurisdictional oversight for investigation and response. Although it can cause some reports to remain open longer, coordinating with other departments uses the expertise of all involved and leverages resources to ensure all allegations are effectively resolved. Management of the department associated with the report must respond to the Whistleblower Program on any action(s) taken in response to the report.

DISPOSITION OF CLOSED REPORTS


Of the 585 reports closed, over half (318, or 54 percent) reached closure after an investigation. Investigation includes research and other preliminary information developed in determining whether a full investigation is warranted or possible.

The remaining 267 closed reports (46 percent) were categorized as follows:

- Referred to another department with Charter jurisdiction. Reporter was referred to the city department with Charter-granted jurisdiction over the alleged issue.
- Merged with previous report. Reporter provided information for a matter that is already under investigation or that the Whistleblower Program previously investigated.
- <u>Closed without investigation.</u> Reporter provided insufficient information to investigate. For example, no indication of department, employee(s) involved, or vehicle number was given.
- <u>Outside of jurisdiction.</u> The alleged issue falls within the jurisdiction of a federal, state, or other noncity government agency or is a suggestion or general report about decisions that are within management's discretion. The Whistleblower Program will advise reporters to file such reports with another fraud hotline program, where one is available and appropriate.
- <u>Information requested and provided.</u> Reporter requested publicly available information and was provided the information.

Exhibit 6 summarizes the disposition of the 585 reports closed in fiscal year 2019-20.

Exhibit 6: 318 of the 585 Reports Closed in Fiscal Year 2019-20 Were Investigated



REPORTS INVESTIGATED AND CLOSED, BY DEPARTMENT

The Whistleblower Program investigated and closed 318 reports in fiscal year 2019-20. The vast majority (281, or 88 percent) of the investigations occurred at city departments with more than 200 authorized FTE positions. Exhibit 7 summarizes the number of reports investigated and closed at these departments for the last three fiscal years.

Exhibit 7: Reports Investigated and Closed in the Last Three Fiscal Years, by Department

Department	Fiscal Year (FY)		Total	Ratio of the Percentage of Repo Investigated and Closed Divided Department's Percentage of City Wor		Divided by	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20		FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Public Health	53	65	88	206	1.11	1.22	1.35
Municipal Transportation	35	41	30	106	0.89	0.92	0.54
Human Services	30	21	16	67	2.01	1.27	0.78
Public Works	19	27	18	64	1.81	2.28	1.22
Sheriff	11	19	28	58	1.53	2.37	2.85
Public Utilities	9	14	12	35	0.58	0.80	0.56
Fire	4	10	21	35	0.32	0.73	1.25
City Administrator	5	7	11	23	0.89	1.09	1.32
Airport	5	7	9	21	0.42	0.53	0.55
Recreation and Park	4	7	9	20	0.58	0.92	0.97
Public Library	6	4	5	15	1.28	0.77	0.78
Police	4	2	4	10	0.20	0.09	0.14
Building Inspection	2	3	5	10	0.98	1.33	1.83
Emergency Management	2	3	2	7	1.07	1.41	0.77
Planning	4	0	3	7	2.69	0.00	1.45
Controller	2	1	3	6	1.06	0.47	1.12
Human Resources	1	1	4	6	0.76	0.63	2.00
Port	1	2	2	5	0.51	0.92	0.74
Technology	3	0	2	5	1.63	0.00	0.83
Treasurer and Tax Collector	1	1	3	5	0.69	0.61	1.50
District Attorney	1	0	2	3	0.50	0.00	0.74
Juvenile Probation	0	0	3	3	0.00	0.00	1.41
City Attorney	0	1	0	1	0.00	0.43	0.00
Public Defender ^b	-	-	1	1	-	-	0.59
Assessor-Recorder ^b	-	-	0	0	-	-	0.00
All Others ^c	26	20	37	83	2.10	1.42	2.53
Total ^d	228	256	318	802	-	-	-

Notes:

^a Th	e City had t	Ratio Legend			
	Fiscal Year FTE		City and County of San Francisco, Salary Ordinance for Fiscal Year Ending:	= 1</td <td>Low</td>	Low
	2019-20	37,907	June 30, 2020, and Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2021	>1 but = 1.25</td <td>Medium</td>	Medium
	2018-19	37,132	June 30, 2019, and Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2020		
	2017-18	36,657.36	June 30, 2018, and Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2019	>1.25	High

^b Department had fewer than 200 authorized FTE positions or did not have reports investigated and closed in fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19.

^c Includes reports investigated and closed at departments with fewer than 200 authorized FTE positions. The names of these departments are excluded from this table to protect the confidentiality of those who reported.

^d See Exhibit 6 for the disposition of all reports closed in the fiscal year, including those referred to another department with Charter-granted jurisdiction over the alleged issue and those closed because they had insufficient information to investigate, were merged with another report, or concerned alleged matters outside the City's jurisdiction.

REPORT OUTCOMES

Of the 318 investigations closed in fiscal year 2019-20, 106 (33 percent) resulted in departments taking corrective or preventive actions, of which there were 116. Exhibit 8 shows the percentage of investigated reports that resulted in a corrective or preventive action since fiscal year 2012-13.

50% 41% 40% 40% 40% 39% 37% 40% 33% 32% 31% 30% 20% 10% 0% FY 12-13 FY 13-14 FY 14-15 FY 15-16 FY 16-17 FY 17-18 FY 18-19 FY 19-20 FY 20-21

Exhibit 8: Percentage of Investigated Reports That Resulted in Corrective or Preventive Action

The Whistleblower Program receives and tracks information on the corrective and preventive actions taken by departments in response to reports. Some reports may involve multiple subjects or contain multiple allegations. Thus, a report may have multiple outcomes.

Allegations reported to the Whistleblower Program are substantiated at a higher rate and result in more corrective and preventive actions when well-informed reporters make high-quality reports that are effectively investigated. The Whistleblower Program educates employees on matters appropriate for investigation by publishing bulletins to make employees aware of the red flags associated with costly occupational frauds. The program has issued bulletins on construction materials fraud, supply chain fraud, incompatible activities, and overtime abuse.

The Whistleblower Program focuses on investigative excellence by collaborating with other jurisdictions to host fraud hotline webinars. In this fiscal year, the program hosted two webinars to promote leading fraud hotline operational practices and effective investigation techniques to jurisdictions throughout the United States. The first webinar, presented in November 2019, was "Guarding Credibility: Maintaining Objectivity in Government Oversight Agencies." The second webinar, presented in June 2020, was "Using Root Cause Analysis to Enhance Your Anti-Fraud and Ethics Process."

The Department of Human Resources publishes a <u>discipline checklist</u> to guide departments through the entire disciplinary process. For most offenses, department management is to use a system of progressive discipline under which the employee is given increasingly more severe discipline each time the employee commits an offense. However, management is not bound by progressive discipline in cases of serious offenses. In these cases, no specific warning or prior disciplinary action must precede an employee being separated from service for cause. A progressive discipline process may include an oral warning, a written warning, a suspension, and finally, separation for cause.

Exhibit 9 shows, by department, the 106 investigations that resulted in corrective or preventive action in fiscal year 2019-20.

Exhibit 9: Investigations That Resulted in Corrective or Preventive Actions in Fiscal Year 2019-20, by Department

Department	Number of Investigations
Public Health	41
Municipal Transportation	14
Public Works	8
Fire	7
Public Utilities	6
All Others*	6
Sheriff	5
Human Services	4
Airport	3
Police	2
Recreation and Park	2
Public Library	2
Human Resources	2
City Administrator	1
Emergency Management	1
Juvenile Probation	1
Planning	1
Total	106

^{*}Includes reports investigated and closed at departments with fewer than 200 authorized FTE positions. The names of these departments are excluded from this table to protect the confidentiality of those who reported.

Exhibit 10 shows the corrective or preventive actions that departments took—116 actions resulting from 106 investigations—in fiscal year 2019-20.

Exhibit 10: Type of Corrective or Preventive Actions in Fiscal Year 2019-20

Action Taken	Quarter1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Total
Personnel Action					
Employee Counseled (Verbal/Written Warning)	20	11	7	6	44
Personnel Action Pending	4	-	5	8	17
Employee Terminated	1	-	-	-	1
Contractor Employee Terminated ^a	-	-	1	-	1
Employee Resigned During Investigation	-	1	1	-	2
Employee Suspended	-	-	-	-	-
Other Corrective Action ^b	12	11	-	-	23
Procedures Changed/Reinforced	4	8	6	10	28
Restitution/Repayment	-	-	-	-	-
Total	41	31	20	24	116

Notes:

^a City Contractors' employees may also be the subject of whistleblower complaints and face personnel actions. The Whistleblower Program began distinguishing contractor employee terminations from city employee terminations in Quarter 3 of fiscal year 2019-20.

^b Other Corrective Action generally includes nonpersonnel corrective actions. Examples include requiring an employee to request approval for additional employment, making employees sign an acknowledgement of receipt of policies, and an employee amending their statement of economic interests.

REPORTS REFERRED TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The Whistleblower Program must refer some of the reports it receives to other organizations that are required by law, contract, or policy to resolve them. Specifically, the Whistleblower Program must send certain reports to the:²

- <u>City department with legal jurisdiction</u> when federal, state, or local law requires another city department to adjudicate the report.
- <u>City department designated in a collective bargaining agreement</u> when the report can be resolved through a grievance mechanism established by an applicable contract between the City and a labor organization.
- <u>Appropriate law enforcement agency</u> (federal, state, or local) when the report involves allegations of conduct that may violate criminal law.
- <u>Investigating city department</u> when the report is related to an existing investigation by the District Attorney, City Attorney, or Ethics Commission and when the applicable official or department states in writing that investigation by the Whistleblower Program would substantially impede or delay its own investigation of the matter.
- <u>Ethics Commission and City Attorney</u> when the report alleges conduct that may violate local campaign finance, lobbying, conflict of interest, or governmental ethics laws, regulations, or rules.

The Whistleblower Program informs complaint reporters when their allegations meet one of the above conditions and, when appropriate, ensures the report is addressed by referring it to the agency with jurisdiction or providing the complaint reporter with contact information for the agency with jurisdiction. Exhibit 11 shows for fiscal year 2019-20 the number of reports referred to other departments with Charter-granted jurisdiction over the topic of the report.

Exhibit 11: Reports Referred to Another Department in Fiscal Year 2019-20, by Quarter


Organization to Which Report	Quarter	Quarter	Quarter	Quarter	% of
Was Referred	1	2	3	4	Referrals
Civil Service	10	9	13	7	31.20%
City Attorney	2	4	13	5	19.20%
Human Resources	11	3	4	2	16.00%
District Attorney	1	3	4	5	10.40%
Ethics	1	4	4	1	8.00%
Unified School District	3	1	1	-	4.00%
Public Health	-	2	-	1	2.40%
Building Inspection	-	-	-	1	0.80%
City College	-	-	-	1	0.80%
Contract Administration	1	-	-	-	0.80%
Mayor's Office of Disability	-	-	-	1	0.80%
Municipal Transportation	1	-	-	-	0.80%
Police Accountability	-	1	-	-	0.80%
Public Works	-	1	-	-	0.80%
Public Utilities	-	1	-	-	0.80%
Recreation and Park	-	-	1	-	0.80%
Shelter Monitoring Committee	-	1	-	-	0.80%
Superior Court	-	1	-	-	0.80%
Total Referred Reports	30	31	40	24	100.00%

² San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, Article IV, Section 4.107(b).

REPORTS OPEN ON JUNE 30, 2020

Of the 105 reports open on June 30, 2020, 43 (or 41 percent) were 90 days old or less at that time. Exhibit 12 shows the age of reports open on June 30, 2020.

Exhibit 12: 43 of the 105 Reports Open on June 30th Were 90 Days Old or Less



The Whistleblower Program examines the factors that delay report closure and, in some cases, works with departments' leadership to address these issues. The Whistleblower Program has focused on training departmental staff responsible for investigating reports to standardize the investigation processes used, increase the investigative skillsets of these employees, and ensure they have a uniform understanding of the responsibilities entrusted to them to carry out Whistleblower Program investigations. Since March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the ability of some departments to investigate certain reports or provide information in a timely manner.

WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION

Retaliation against whistleblowers is illegal. Protections exist for city officers and employees who in good faith file, or attempt to file, reports with the Whistleblower Program, Ethics Commission, District Attorney, City Attorney, or their own department, or who provide any information in connection with or otherwise cooperate with a whistleblower investigation.³

Whistleblower protections also apply to city contractors and their employees who file reports with any supervisor in a city department or who provide any information in connection with or otherwise cooperate with a whistleblower investigation.⁴

The Ethics Commission is the city department responsible for investigating reports alleging whistleblower retaliation. Exhibit 13 summarizes the results reported by the City's Ethics Commission, including the 15 retaliation reports (11 related to the Whistleblower Program) that were open on June 30th and the number of retaliation reports the Ethics Commission received, closed, and sustained in Quarter 4.

Exhibit 13: Whistleblower Retaliation Reports Received and Closed by the Ethics Commission in Quarter 4

Retaliation Reports With the Ethics Commission	All Retaliation Reports	Retaliation Reports Related to the Whistleblower Program
Open on April 1, 2020	19	13
Received	1	1
Closed	5	3
Sustained (of those closed)	-	-
Open on June 30, 2020	15	11

Source: Ethics Commission

To establish retaliation, a reporter must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the complaint reporter's engagement in a protected activity was a substantial motivating factor for an adverse action that a city officer or employee took against the complaint reporter. Reports of retaliation must be filed no later than two years after the date of the alleged retaliation.

The Ethics Commission's <u>website</u> has more information on whistleblower protections, retaliation investigations, and available remedies in the event retaliation occurred.

³ Ibid., Section 4.115(a).

⁴ Ibid., Section 4.117(a).

PUBLIC INTEGRITY TIP LINE

In response to the federal criminal charges filed against former Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, which were made public on January 28, 2020, the Controller's Office and City Attorney's Office began a joint public corruption investigation and opened a Public Integrity Tip Line (Tip Line) on February 4th to gather information specific to the investigation. Also, the Controller's Office, in cooperation with the City Attorney's Office, instituted additional controls and reviews of Public Works contracts, purchase orders, and grants for red flags and process failures. On June 29th the Controller's Office issued "Public Integrity Review: Preliminary Assessment of San Francisco Public Works Contracting."

The Tip Line, which is staffed by Whistleblower Program investigators, received seven tips from April 1 through June 30, 2020. These tips were carefully reviewed to determine whether the information they contain could be used for the joint public corruption investigation or is more appropriate for another government agency to address. As shown in Exhibit 14, of the seven tips received:

- One was found to be relevant to the joint public corruption investigation and was referred to the City Attorney's Office for further review and coordination.
- Six were retained by the Whistleblower Program after consultation with the City Attorney, as the allegations were determined to be more appropriate for investigation by the Controller's Office.

Exhibit 14: Dispositon of Public Integrity Tip Line Tips in Quarter 4, by Department

Disposition	Number of Tips
Retained by Whistleblower Program	6
Referred to City Attorney	1
Total	7

Public Integrity Tip Line Intake

Public integrity tips can be provided via e-mail at <u>publicintegrity@sfgov.org</u> or by phone at (415) 554-7657. All tips may be submitted anonymously and will remain confidential.

Investigation Results

Investigations highlighted in this section resulted in a department taking some corrective or preventive action. The diversity of these allegations and resolutions demonstrates the breadth and complexity of the Whistleblower Program's investigative work.

A complete list of reports published in previous reporting periods can be found on the Whistleblower Program Summary Reports page.

SUMMARY OF ALL INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING IN CORRECTIVE OR PREVENTIVE ACTION IN QUARTER 4

In addition to the recommendations in "<u>Public Integrity Review: Preliminary Assessment of San</u> <u>Francisco Public Works Contracting</u>," published on June 29th, investigations highlighted in this section resulted in a department taking some corrective or preventive action in Quarter 4.

Allegation	Resolution Based on Investigation
Employees of a city contractor blocked an intersection and bike lane in a city vehicle and were discourteous to a member of the public when confronted.	The investigation substantiated the allegations. The department verbally warned the two employees and retrained them on the department's driving policies.
An employee inappropriately used city time and resources to promote a family member's participation in a contest.	The investigation found that the department approved the promotion of an event in which the employee's family member was a contestant. Before the department advised the employee further, the employee posted event fliers in the workplace soliciting favor for their family member. The department counseled the employee on their inappropriate solicitation of coworkers, and the employee removed the fliers.
An employee has unreported secondary employment and did not disclose this business on a Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700). Also, the employee violated Civil Service rules in deciding to hire an employee who lacks the minimum qualifications for their position.	The investigation found the employee inappropriately had not disclosed their additional employment but had not engaged in additional employment since joining the department and did not plan on reactivating the business. The department re-issued the Statement of Incompatible Activities to the employee and confirmed with the employee that they are required to submit an Additional Employment Request should they re-engage in their secondary employment. The allegation of improper hiring was referred to the Civil Service Commission for investigation.

Allegation	Resolution Based on Investigation
An employee and division management inappropriately direct employees to drive city vehicles unnecessary miles to ensure the division retains their vehicles. Subject employee inappropriately used a city vehicle to drive to their home.	The investigation found that the division identifies its low-mileage city vehicles to ensure all vehicles are used regularly and that division management asks employees to drive vehicles long enough to adequately charge their batteries. The investigation also found that the employee had approval to commute to and from their residence in a city vehicle. The department states that it will re-issue the City's Vehicle Use Policy to all division employees and will review its fleet management protocols and evaluate whether additional controls are needed.
An employee made disrespectful remarks to a subordinate.	The investigation substantiated the allegation. The department counseled the employee and reminded them of their obligation to adhere to relevant city and department policies to treat coworkers and the public with respect.
Employees failed to install recommended equipment in the course of their duties, and the department did not address a previous complaint.	The investigation partially substantiated the allegation that employees did not install certain equipment consistent with industry best practices but did not substantiate that the department failed to address a previous complaint. The department directed the employees to follow industry best practices in future.
Employees falsify their timecards and do not follow industry standards in performing their work. The unit lacks appropriate safety measures, which violates industry standards. Managers give preferential treatment to some employees. Certain employees offer incentives in exchange for referrals. One employee has (unreported) additional employment. Another employee supervises a relative and approves the relative's timecards. Multiple employees do not meet the minimum qualifications of their classifications.	The investigation substantiated that two employees regularly falsified their timecard entries and that the department did not have appropriate safety measures. The department counseled the employees to adhere to the department's time and attendance policies and created a corrective action plan to resolve the safety issues. The investigation did not substantiate the remaining allegations regarding preferential treatment to specific employees or offering incentives in exchange for referrals. The allegations regarding an employee's unreported additional employment and an employee supervising their relative were referred to the Department of Human Resources. Allegations regarding the merit system were referred to the Civil Service Commission.
A manager did not notify an employee of their privacy rights in the workplace, and the employee was filmed by a contractor without their consent.	The investigation substantiated the allegations. The department counseled and retrained the manager on the City's employee rights policy.

Allegation	Resolution Based on Investigation
An employee arrives late and leaves early, not fulfilling their job duties. The employee's supervisor is aware of this but has not taken corrective action. The supervisor lied about the employee to investigators in a previous investigation. Some employees were hired based on nepotism and do not meet the minimum qualifications for their classifications.	The investigation substantiated that the employee comes to work late and leaves early. The investigation did not substantiate that the supervisor had not taken corrective action as the supervisor is not responsible for approving the employee's timecards. However, the department has now assigned the employee to their supervisor's work location. The investigation also did not substantiate that the supervisor was untruthful to investigators in a previous investigation. Allegations regarding the hiring of unqualified individuals due to nepotism were referred to the Civil Service Commission.
An employee inappropriately disappears from the workplace, barely performs any work, takes long breaks, and works an excessive amount of overtime.	The investigation did not substantiate the allegations, but the department plans to implement new procedures to more effectively track and monitor overtime usage.
An employee falsifies time and attendance records by arriving late to work and claiming compensation for time that was not worked.	The investigation substantiated that the employee could not account for their time and attendance for part of one day and found that the employee inappropriately worked beyond their regularly scheduled hours, without a supervisor's prior written authorization, to make up for times when they were tardy. Disciplinary action is pending.
An employee acted unprofessionally by writing an e-mail in which they refused to perform work and threatened to add notable individuals to the correspondence. The employee is never in their office.	The first allegation was previously investigated, substantiated, and resulted in a written coaching and counseling document issued to the employee. The investigation did not substantiate that the employee is never in their office.
An employee engaged in unauthorized medical research and misused city resources to support the research.	The investigation determined that the allegation was similar to one received in a previous complaint that was closed pending corrective and disciplinary action. The follow-up to the pending action resulting from the previous complaint will include the content of this allegation.
Two employees were witnessed engaging in sexual activity in a secluded but publicly-accessible location.	The investigation did not substantiate the allegation, but the department reminded the employees of their obligations under the city Policy on Family and Romantic Relationships at Work.

Allegation	Resolution Based on Investigation
An employee misuses city funds on inappropriate purchases. Without authorization, the employee installed a camera in the workplace to screen people entering the workplace. The employee takes excessive lunch breaks.	The investigation did not substantiate that the employee misused city funds or took excessive lunch breaks but did substantiate that the employee had installed a camera in the workplace, contrary to departmental privacy policies. The investigation also found that the employee and their supervisor had lied to investigators about the purpose of the camera and their knowledge of it. Disciplinary action against both the employee and supervisor is pending.
A manager favors young female employees by giving them promotions and new titles. The manager encourages a hostile work environment by intimidating and bullying his staff. The manager retaliated against an employee by inappropriately reassigning the employee to a subject matter area with which they were unfamiliar. The manager also inappropriately shared private information about an employee with their supervisor.	A previous investigation addressed the allegations of favoritism and creating a hostile work environment. The current investigation substantiated the alleged inappropriate reassignment and sharing of private information. The department assigned the manager new duties and removed certain employees from the manager's supervision. Also, the department put the manager on a corrective action plan and provided additional coaching and counseling.
An employee harassed a coworker, and department management ignored complaints about it.	The investigation substantiated that the employee harassed other employees but did not substantiate that management ignored complaints of harassment. Disciplinary action is pending.
Management designated too many employees as essential, which required them to work on site, thereby increasing staff's risk of exposure to COVID-19. Management inappropriately used personal devices to conduct city business and forced staff to inappropriately take personal leave when staff expressed concerns about the risk of working on site during the pandemic.	The investigation did not substantiate the allegations. However, in response to the allegations, and as a part of its evolving response to challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the department developed and implemented changes to its operating procedures to further limit the risk of its employees being exposed to the coronavirus.

Allegation Resolution Based on Investigation Management shows favoritism to certain The investigation substantiated that two managers employees and allows them to falsify time and favored certain employees, allowed them to falsify their attendance records. Some managers and time and attendance records, and ignored complaints employees have unreported secondary about the falsification. The investigation also employment. These practices unnecessarily substantiated that one of the managers and at least strain the other staff. one employee had unreported secondary employment. The investigation did not substantiate that these practices strained the other staff. The department states it will train management on its time and attendance procedures, provide management training, place written reprimands in their personnel files, and counsel them on appropriate behavior with staff. The department will also require employees with secondary employment to apply for departmental approval. Additional personnel action is pending. A department's operation regularly exceeds safe The investigation found that: operating levels, which limits the ability of The operation regularly exceeds capacity, but employees to monitor their work, respond to management cannot limit the number of client needs and incidents, ensure privacy, and incoming clients. That is, it cannot turn away work in a secure environment. The operation clients. does not have policies and procedures for or Incidental exposure of clients' private adequately staff one of its programs. information is unavoidable in the working environment and necessary to serve clients. For the security of its clients, the operation does not provide locked facilities. The investigation also found that, as part of a separate review, the department had previously identified and proactively addressed some of these issues. Specifically, the department had found that the staff-to-client ratio regularly exceeded prescribed levels and that clients had to share small spaces, which did not allow privacy. In response to these findings, the department: Adjusted the operation's workflow, space, and processes to ensure the staff-to-client ratio is appropriately monitored and managed.

Ended practices that did not provide privacy to

Is working with the operation's management to ensure employees and clients are protected

clients.

from security threats.

Allegation	Resolution Based on Investigation
Employees falsify time and attendance records by clocking in and out for each other and claim compensation for time they did not work. Management creates unnecessary work for	The investigation found that at least two employees regularly falsified time and attendance records by having their coworkers clock out for them hours after they had left work. Supervisors allowed, and in some cases instructed, staff to clock other employees out.
overtime that can be done during regular working hours and allowed one employee to drive home while intoxicated. An employee has unreported secondary	The investigation also found that employees misuse city vehicles for personal purposes, and that one employee had unauthorized secondary employment. The investigation did not substantiate that the employee
employment and instructs other employees to do work for that business on city time.	with secondary employment or other employees worked for that business on city time.
	The department counseled employees on time and attendance policies, overtime, and the appropriate use of city vehicles and required one employee to submit an additional employment request form.
	The investigation found that, after being told an employee was intoxicated, a supervisor allowed the employee to drive home, which is contrary to proper procedure. The supervisor was required to attend Post Accident & Reasonable Suspicion Training for supervisors. Additional personnel action is pending.
An employee harassed other employees.	The investigation substantiated the allegation. Disciplinary action is pending.
An employee falsifies their time and attendance records. The employee and other employees have unreported secondary employment.	The investigation did not substantiate that any employee falsified time and attendance records but did find that one employee had unreported secondary employment several years ago. Although the employee no longer has secondary employment, the department counseled the employee regarding the previous violation.
A supervisor insufficiently monitored an employee while performing their duties, which led to a task not being properly completed. Another employee did not act professionally when the issue was brought to their attention.	The investigation found that the supervisor appropriately monitored the employee, but the employee violated policies and procedures regarding the task. To prevent this in the future, management reinforced proper policies and procedures with the employees.

File a Whistleblower Report

Report the misuse of funds, waste, or mismanagement in City and County of San Francisco programs and operations by contacting the Whistleblower Program.

Internet: http://sfcontroller.org/whistleblower-program

Telephone: 311 or, if outside the 415 area code, 415-701-2311

OR download a report form and return it via:

E-Mail: whistleblower@sfgov.org

Mail: Office of the Controller

Attention: Whistleblower Program

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316

San Francisco, CA 94102

Fax: 415-554-7856

INVESTIGATIONS ARE CONFIDENTIAL.
REPORTERS MAY REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

Whistleblower Program Contact Information				
Dave Jensen	Supervising Investigator	415-915-8105	dave.a.jensen@sfgov.org	
Eryl Karr	Senior Investigator	415-610-5044	eryl.karr@sfgov.org	
Steven Muñoz	Senior Investigator	415-636-7798	steven.munoz@sfgov.org	
Matthew Thomas	Acting Senior Investigator	415-855-2967	matthew.s.thomas@sfgov.org	
Tiffany Wong	Senior Investigator	415-636-8578	tiffany.b.wong@sfgov.org	
William Zhou	Acting Senior Investigator	415-636-9405	william.zhou@sfgov.org	

File a Public Integrity Tip

Report Public Integrity Tips by e-mail at public Integrity@sfgov.org or by phone at (415) 554-7657. All tips may be submitted anonymously and will remain confidential.

From: San Francisco Controller"s Office Reports

To: <u>Calvillo, Angela (BOS)</u>

Subject: Reports Issued: Quarterly Review of the Treasurer's Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as

of 3/31/20

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:36:49 PM

Office of the Controller

City Services Auditor

Report Issued

The City and County of San Francisco (City), Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer), coordinates with the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) to conduct quarterly reviews of the City's investment fund.

CSA today issued a report on the quarterly review of the Treasurer's Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of March 31, 2020. CSA engaged Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO) to perform this service. Based on its review, MGO is not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the schedule in order for it to be in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Download the full report



Sign up to receive news and updates

This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Acting Director of Audits Mark de la Rosa at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7574, or the Audits Division at (415) 554-7469.

For media queries, please contact Communications Manager Alyssa Sewlal at <u>alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org</u> or (415) 957-2211.





Share this email:



Manage your preferences | Opt out using TrueRemove®

Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.

View this email online.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102 US	
This email was sent to angela.calvillo@sfgov.org. To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.	

Quarterly Review of the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of March 31, 2020

Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector



About the Audits Division

The City Services Auditor (CSA) was created in the Office of the Controller through an amendment to the City and County of San Francisco (City) Charter that voters approved in November 2003. Within CSA, the Audits Division ensures the City's financial integrity and promotes efficient, effective, and accountable government by:

- Conducting performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and business processes.
- Investigating reports received through its whistleblower hotline of fraud, waste, and abuse of city resources.
- Providing actionable recommendations to city leaders to promote and enhance accountability and improve the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

Audit Team:

Winnie Woo, Senior Auditor

Audit Consultant:

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO)

For more information please contact:

Mark de la Rosa **Acting Director of Audits** Office of the Controller City and County of San Francisco (415) 554-5393



http://www.sfcontroller.org



♀ @sfcontroller



in LinkedIn Office of the Controller



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

September 8, 2020

Mr. José Cisneros, Treasurer Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector City Hall, Room 140 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Dear Mr. Cisneros:

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) presents the review report of the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer) of the City and County of San Francisco (City) as of March 31, 2020. The schedule presents the total cash, investments, and accrued interest receivable under the Treasurer's control and accountability.

As of March 31, 2020	Amount
Cash	\$262,509,257
Investments	12,264,902,683
Interest Receivable	53,354,289
Total Cash, Investments, and Interest Receivable	\$12,580,766,229

CSA engaged Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO) to conduct the review. Based on this review, MGO is not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of March 31, 2020, for it to be in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. However, as explained in Note II.B. to the schedule, investments are recorded as of the settlement date, and management has not presented the risk disclosures required under Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 40, Deposit and Investment Risk Disclosures – an amendment of GASB Statement No. 3.

CSA and MGO appreciate the assistance and cooperation of Treasurer staff during the review. For questions regarding the report, please contact me at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 415-554-7574 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Respectfully,

Mark de la Rosa

Acting Director of Audits

cc: Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board

City Attorney

Civil Grand Jury Mayor Public Library

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR

Independent Accountant's Review Report and Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable

March 31, 2020





Independent Accountant's Review Report

Honorable Mayor and Members of the Board of Supervisors City and County of San Francisco, California

We have reviewed the accompanying Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable (Schedule) of the City and County of San Francisco's (City) Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer) as of March 31, 2020, and the related notes to the Schedule. A review includes primarily applying analytical procedures to management's financial data and making inquiries of management. A review is substantially less in scope than an audit, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion regarding the financial statements as a whole. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Management's Responsibility for the Schedule

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the Schedule in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement whether due to fraud or error.

Accountant's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to conduct the review engagement in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services promulgated by the Accounting and Review Services Committee of the American Institute Certified Public Accountants. Those standards require us to perform procedures to obtain limited assurance as a basis for reporting whether we are aware of any material modifications that should be made to the Schedule for it to be in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We believe that the results of our procedures provide a reasonable basis for our conclusion.

Accountant's Conclusion

Based on our review, except for the issue noted in the Known Departure from Accounting Principles Generally Accepted in the United States of America paragraph, we are not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the accompanying Schedule in order for it to be in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Known Departure from Accounting Principles Generally Accepted in the United States of America As disclosed in Note II.B. to the Schedule, the Treasurer's management has recorded investments as of the settlement date rather than the trade date and has not presented the risk and fair value disclosures required under Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 40, Deposit and Investment Risk Disclosures—an amendment of GASB Statement No. 3, and Statement No. 72, Fair Value Measurement and Application. The amount by which this departure would affect the Schedule is not reasonably determinable.

Macias Gihi & O'Connell D
San Francisco, California
September 1, 2020

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CASH, INVESTMENTS, AND ACCRUED INTEREST RECEIVABLE MARCH 31, 2020

Cash in Bank - Investment Pool		262,509,257
Investments:		
U.S. Treasury Notes		2,081,059,750
Federal Agencies		4,741,471,584
Commercial Paper		954,974,946
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit		2,008,567,598
Public Time Deposits		45,000,000
Corporate Medium Term Notes		5,072,600
State and Local Government Agencies		81,441,567
Money Market Funds		1,421,562,862
Supranational Obligations		925,751,776
Subtotal Investments		12,264,902,683
Interest Receivable - Investment Pool, Net		53,354,289
Total Cash, Investments, and Interest Receivable	\$	12,580,766,229

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR

NOTES TO THE SCHEDULE OF CASH, INVESTMENTS, AND ACCRUED INTEREST RECEIVABLE MARCH 31, 2020

I. General

The Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable (Schedule) presents only the cash in bank, investments, and related accrued interest receivable under the control and accountability of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer) of the City and County of San Francisco (City). The Schedule is not intended to present fairly the financial position of the Treasurer or of the City.

The Treasurer is responsible for the custody and investment of a majority of the public funds held by the City and funds deposited by external entities that are either required to or voluntarily deposit funds with the Treasurer. The Treasurer is authorized to conduct these functions by the California Government Code Section 53600 et seq. and the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10, under investment policies established by the Treasurer and filed with the City's Board of Supervisors. The Treasurer also provides a safekeeping service for the City, where City departments may deposit securities and other assets in the Treasurer's vault.

II. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Cash and Deposits

The California Government Code requires California banks and savings and loan associations to secure the City's deposits not covered by federal deposit insurance by pledging government securities, letters of credit or first deed mortgage notes as collateral. The fair value of pledged securities will range between 105 and 150 percent of the City's deposits, depending on the type of security pledged. Pledging letters of credit issued by the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco must have a fair value of at least 105 percent of the secured public deposits. Pledging first deed mortgage notes must have a fair value of at least 150 percent of the secured public deposits. Government securities must equal at least 110 percent of the City's deposits. The collateral must be held at the pledging bank's trust department or another bank, acting as the pledging bank's agent, in the City's name. For deposits not covered by federal deposit insurance, all of the banks with funds deposited by the Treasurer secure deposits with sufficient collateral.

B. Investments

The Treasurer makes investments in securities for a pooled money investment account and for individual investment accounts that are not invested through the pooled money investment account. The Schedule is prepared using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Investment transactions are recorded on the settlement date. However, generally accepted accounting principles in the United States of America require investments to be recorded on the trade date. Deposits and investments with the Treasurer are exposed to risks such as credit risk, concentration of credit risk, and interest rate risk. Disclosures related to such risks as required under Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 40, Deposit and Investment Risk Disclosures—an amendment of GASB Statement No. 3, and disclosures about fair value measurements, the level of fair value hierarchy, and valuation techniques required under Statement No. 72, Fair Value Measurement and Application are not presented in this report as the Treasurer does not believe that these disclosures are necessary to meet the objectives of the users of the Schedule.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF THE TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR

NOTES TO THE SCHEDULE OF CASH, INVESTMENTS, AND ACCRUED INTEREST RECEIVABLE MARCH 31, 2020

II. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

The securities in the accompanying Schedule are reported at fair value in accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 72, Fair Value Measurement and Application. The following table summarizes the investments stated at cost and fair value, which is based on current market prices.

Investment Type	Cost	Fair Value
Investments from Investment Pool:		
U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 2,063,089,067	\$ 2,081,059,750
Federal Agencies	4,700,002,121	4,741,471,584
Commercial Paper	950,271,543	954,974,946
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	2,004,379,064	2,008,567,598
Public Time Deposits	45,000,000	45,000,000
Corporate Medium Term Notes	4,997,000	5,072,600
State and Local Government Agencies	80,301,528	81,441,567
Money Market Funds	1,421,562,862	1,421,562,862
Supranational Obligations	918,039,690	925,751,776
Total Investments	\$ 12,187,642,875	\$ 12,264,902,683

From: Sobrepena, Amanda (CON)

To: <u>Calvillo, Angela (BOS)</u>; <u>Elsbernd, Sean (MYR)</u>

Cc: Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Kelly, Naomi (ADM); Carroll, Maryellen (DEM); Rydstrom, Todd (CON); delaRosa, Mark

(CON)

Subject: Give2SF Monthly Report - 7/31/20

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 8:55:11 AM

Attachments: Give2SF Monthly Update Memorandum 08.31.2020.pdf

Give2SF Monetary Donations List (Through 08.28.2020).xlsx Give2SF In-Kind Donations Attachment (Through 08.28.2020).xlsx

Madame Clerk and Mr. Chief of Staff,

Attached is the Controller's now-monthly report on the Give2SF fund, dated August 31, 2020. Please forward in your respective offices as you believe best.

Thank you and please let us know if you have any questions.

Amanda Sobrepeña

Office of the Controller, City & County of San Francisco

(415) 554-7658 | amanda.sobrepena@sfgov.org

Pronouns: She/Her



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield Controller Todd Rydstrom Deputy Controller

Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund

Monthly Status Update

TO: Mayor's Office

Board of Supervisors

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller

CC: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator, General Services Agency

Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director, Department of Emergency Management

DATE: August 31, 2020

SUBJECT: City and County of San Francisco's Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund

The Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund (Give2SF) is a special fund established by the City and County of San Francisco (City) as part of the <u>Second Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency</u>, dated February 25, 2020, and issued on March 13, 2020. This memorandum summarizes both monetary and in-kind donations (goods) for Give2SF.

Monetary Donations

The Second Supplement authorizes the Controller to accept and expend funds to provide shelter, food, financial assistance, and other assistance to individuals and families in San Francisco impacted by the emergency; to replace, repair, and rebuild public buildings, infrastructure, and other assets for use in the City's efforts to respond to the emergency; to issue and administer grants and/or interest-free loans to small businesses in San Francisco to compensate for economic harms resulting from COVID-19; and for other city efforts to address the impacts of COVID-19. The Twenty-Sixth Supplement to the mayoral declaration, dated August 26, 2020, authorizes the Controller to accept and expend funds to support youth programs, including but not limited to, Community Hub and Emergency Child & Youth Care spaces that ensure professional supervision and access to educational and technological resources, physical activity, food, social and emotional development, and other support for the most vulnerable children and youth.

Within the authorized uses outlined above, the City has identified four priority areas for the use of the Give2SF funds: (1) food security, (2) access to housing, (3) security for workers and small businesses, and (4) youth programs. Disbursements of funds are approved by a committee consisting of City Administrator Naomi Kelly, Director of Emergency Management Mary Ellen Carroll, and myself.

Through August 28, 2020:

- \$28,618,127 has been donated to and received by Give2SF both directly and through the San Francisco Foundation, \$28,319,000 of which has been allocated.
- Of \$28,319,000 that has been allocated:
 - \$18,435,000 is for programs operated by the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and Recreation and Park Department, Human Services Agency, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Early Care and Education, or Office of Economic and Workforce Development.
 - o \$9,884,000 has been allocated to programs that will be administered, with city oversight, by nonprofit organizations through grant agreements between them and the San Francisco Foundation.

The exhibits below summarize this information, including how departments have disbursed the funds through their programs. An attachment to this memorandum shows the individual donations received, including donor name, date, amount, and fund (and excludes individual donations received by departments directly for their own use).

Exhibit 1: Total Donations Received by Give2SF

Donations Received Directly by Give2SF	Donations to Give2SF Through San Francisco Foundation	Total Donations Received
\$7,667,686	\$20,950,441	\$28,618,127

Exhibit 2: Total Approved Disbursements and Disbursements to Departments, by Use of Fund

Department	Use of Fund	Disbursements Approved	Disbursements Made
Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and Recreation and Park Department	Youth programs	\$125,000	\$0
Human Services Agency	Food security	\$6,660,000	\$6,660,000
Office of Early Care and Education	Security for workers and small businesses	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Security for workers and small businesses	\$4,360,000	\$4,360,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Access to housing	\$6,290,000	\$6,290,000
	Total	\$18,435,000	\$18,310,000

Exhibit 3: Human Services Agency's Program Uses and Impacts

Purpose	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Amount	Impact
Senior/ Disability Food and Nutrition Network	Support equipment, staffing, and other infrastructure needed to modify services under COVID-19 (for example, freezers to provide multiday meal packs, additional delivery drivers and vehicles).	Department of Disability and Aging Services Network Providers ^a	\$1,600,000	100,000 new meals per month and supporting program modifications to maintain pre-COVID- 19 service levels of 250,000 meals per month
Undocu-	Support low-income undocumented and	HealthySF	\$500,000	2,631 households ^b
mented and Immigrant Households	immigrant households who may be ineligible for mainstream benefits (for example, CalFresh) by providing gift cards ranging from \$200 to \$600 in value.	Chinese for Affirmative Action	\$300,000	500-700 households
Family Support	Support low-income families with gift cards distributed through Family Resource Centers (value based on household size), which operate in high-priority zip codes (based on COVID-19 infection rate, CalFresh application volume, and other factors).	Family Resource Centers	\$750,000	Up to 1,400 families
Isolation/ Quarantine Support	Meet emergency food needs of households in isolation/quarantine due to confirmed or suspected infection until regular food support is established.	Shanti Project	\$75,000	300-450 households
LGBTQ Food Relief	Distribute gift cards to help LGBTQ people meet urgent food needs, with a particular focus on trans people of color, trans immigrants, low-income LGBTQ people, and those who have lost their income due to COVID-19.	LGBTQ Center	\$75,000	300-400 individuals
Food Relief for Low- Income Transitional Age Youth	Distribute gift cards to transitional age youth (age 18 to 24) receiving Medi-Cal benefits through the Human Services Agency, a group who reported pressing food needs via an agency-administered survey and are unlikely to receive other disaster assistance food support.	N/A – To be distributed by Human Services Agency	\$860,000	3,700-4,000 individuals
Support for Mothers and Infants of	Distribute gift cards to support mothers and infants from communities of color, leveraging culturally appropriate	SisterWeb SF Community Doula Network	\$103,500	75 families
COIOI	Color pregnancy and postpartum care programs to reach low-income African-American, Latinx, and Pacific Islander pregnant women. Clients will receive \$599 to \$1,200 in gift cards over the support period.		\$68,885	115 families

Purpose	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Amount	Impact
Food Support for Latinx	Support distribution of culturally- appropriate groceries to the Latinx	CANA/ Mission Food Hub	\$700,000	To be quantified ^c
Community	community. This includes groceries picked up in-person at pantries and deliveries to vulnerable residents.	Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY)	\$99,000	300 families
Meals for HOPE SF	Support distribution of prepared meals to residents in the Sunnydale and Potrero	Mercy Housing	\$192,000	To be quantified ^c
Residents	HOPE SF sites. Meals will be delivered 2-3 times per week for up to 16 weeks. This funding helps to sustain existing efforts at these locations.	Shanti Project	\$96,000	To be quantified ^c
Emergency and Short- Term Funding Support for Communities	Sustain meal service to homeless encampments during two-week gap in regular service through the Meals in Place program (neighborhoods: Upper Market, SOMA, Mission, and Bayview)	Nourish	\$292,824	19,600 meals distributed
of Color ^d	Support distribution of meals through the African-American Faith-Based Coalition to older and otherwise at-risk African-American households citywide.	San Francisco New Deal	\$241,955	21,916 meals distributed
	Support distribution of meals through Mother Brown's Dining Hall in the Bayview to ensure maintenance of weekend meal service levels.	La Cocina	\$22,600	2,000 meals distributed
	Pilot a weekly hot meal to supplement food resources for low-income Treasure Island residents.	One Treasure Island	\$14,000	160 residents
Additional Food Security Programs Focused on Communities of Color	An additional \$2,500,000 has recently been allocated to the Human Services Agency for food security programs focused on communities of color. The Human Services Agency is coordinating closely with the COVID-19 Command Center's food security stakeholder group and community leaders to plan how the remaining funds will be allocated.	To be determined ^c	\$669,236	To be quantified ^c
		Total	\$6,660,000	

Notes

Source: Human Services Agency

^a Bayview Senior Services, Centro Latino, Episcopal Community Services, Glide, Jewish Family & Children's Services, Kimochi, Meals on Wheels, On Lok/30th Street, Project Open Hand, Russian American Community Services, San Francisco-Marin Food Bank, Self-Help for the Elderly

^b Total card value exceeds allocation because bulk purchase of cards provides 5 percent discount.

^c Program/service delivery is in the planning phase. Grantees and impacts will be reported in subsequent reports.

^d These initiatives were identified by the Emergency Operations Center Feeding Group as needing short-term support to fill critical funding gaps for community-driven efforts serving communities of color.

Exhibit 4: Office of Economic and Workforce Development Program Uses and Impacts

Purpose	Description	Grantee	Amount	Impact
Small Business Resiliency Grants	Make emergency grants to eligible small businesses with evidence of at least 25% revenue loss in a 30-day period.	Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	\$1,000,000	At least 100 small businesses to access grants of up to \$10,000
Small Business No-Interest	San Francisco Hardship Emergency Loan Program (SF HELP) funds can be used to pay	Mission Economic Development Agency	\$1,000,000	At least 20 businesses to access no-interest loan of up to \$50,000
Loans	payroll, rent, utilities, inventory, and more. Flexible loan terms determined on a case-by-case basis, based on borrower's ability to repay.	Main Street Launch	\$1,200,000	At least 24 businesses to access no-interest loan of up to \$50,000
Supportive Services for Immigrant	Provide direct support to immigrants and undocumented children, families, and	Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (Subrecipient: SF Labor Council)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
Workers	communities affected by COVID-19.	Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (Subrecipient: UndocuFund SF)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Bay Area Community Resources	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
Supportive Services for	Provide direct relief to support immigrants and undocumented	Bay Area Community Resources	\$100,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
Food Security	children, families, and communities affected by COVID-19.	Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$100,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
	Provide support to the Mission District Food Hub, which Carnaval kicked off on Cinco de Mayo.	San Francisco Arts Commission (Subrecipient: Cultura y Arte Nativa de las Americas (CANA))	\$100,000	Provide groceries to 4,000 disadvantaged, mostly immigrant households
	Provide direct relief to support vulnerable residents in low-income communities of color hard-hit by the pandemic, with a focus on public housing residents and at-risk households.	Human Rights Commission (Subrecipients El/La Para TransLatinas, Larkin Street Youth Services, Code Tenderloin, Rafiki Coalition, Collective Impact, Calle 24)	\$350,000	Provide meals to 6,000 vulnerable residents*
	Support food relief efforts for low-income, limited English-speaking workers who test positive for COVID-19 and find they cannot support themselves during quarantine.	Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$50,000	Provide support to 250 low-income, vulnerable, disconnected households
		Total	\$4,360,000	

 $^{^{*}}$ Meals funded by \$100,000 of the \$350,000. Use of the remaining \$250,000 is in the planning phase. Full impact will be shown in subsequent reports.

Source: Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Exhibit 5: Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development's Program Uses and Impact

Program	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Amount	Impact
Housing Stabilization	up to \$3,000 for rent, mortgage, utility, and other housing costs to eligible households per application period (with an assistance cap of \$10,000 per household). Households are eligible, regardless of immigration status, if they have	Catholic Charities of San Francisco	\$1,258,000	More than 7,600 applications received requesting financial
		Eviction Defense Collaborative	\$1,258,000	assistance of over \$34 million. To date, 1,000 prioritized
		La Raza Community Resource Center	\$1,258,000	applications are in the process of
	experienced a substantial loss of income due to COVID-19 and cannot afford their housing costs.	Q Foundation	\$1,258,000	receiving up to a combined \$3,000,000 in initial
	Applications are run through a prioritization tool that identifies households that are most at risk.	Young Community Developers	\$1,258,000	assistance.
		Total	\$6,290,000	

Source: Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Exhibit 6: Office of Early Care and Education's Program Uses and Impact

Program	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Amount		lmp	act*	
Family Child Care (FCC) Emergency Operating Grants	Provide economic relief to FCC educators, who represent a sector of self-employed, low-income workers, who are not eligible or do not have	Low Income Investment Fund (LIIF)		165 grants homes (ser and 130 sm up to 8 chil	ving up all FCC	to 14 home	es (serving
	access to many of the funding resources available to other business sectors, in order to help FCCs to			Type Chinese Spanish	25 7	63 38	\$565,000 \$260,000
	survive loss of revenue until full enrollment can begin again.			English Total	3 35	29 130	\$175,000 \$1,000,000
		Total	\$1,000,000				

^{*} The application deadline was July 17, 2020. LIIF is distributing grants to FCC grantees via direct deposit. Source: Office of Early Care and Education

Exhibit 7: Department of Children, Youth and Their Families' and Recreation and Park Department's Program Uses and Impact

Program	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Allocated Amount*	Impact
COVID-19 Community Hubs Initiative	Community Hubs are designed to support children and youth who: are part of low-income households; live in HOPE SF, public housing, or single-room occupancy hotels; are experiencing homelessness; are foster youth; or are English language learners.	YMCA of San Francisco	\$125,000	Provide backpacks and supplies for children and youth who meet one of the following criteria: 1) are in kindergarten through 6 th grade, are enrolled in any phase of the Community Hubs, and are from a high-need community as defined by the program design (up to 6,000 individuals); or 2) others in kindergarten through 6 th grade and those above the 6 th grade level who live within walking distance of a Community Hub but cannot enroll.
		Total	\$125,000	

^{*} The allocated amount has not yet been distributed to the department, so it cannot yet distribute the funds to the nonprofit organization partner.

Source: Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and Recreation and Park Department

Exhibit 8: Total Approved Disbursements from the San Francisco Foundation Directly to Nonprofit Organizations With City Oversight

Program	Oversight Department(s)	Disbursements Approved		
Emergency Family Relief Fund	Office of Economic and Workforce Development/Human Rights Commission	\$4,884,000		
Right to Recover	Office of Economic and Workforce Development/Human Rights Commission	\$2,000,000		
COVID-19 Related Grants and Loans for Small Businesses				
	Total			

Exhibit 9: Uses, Impacts, and Grant Status for Programs Funded by Grant Agreements Between the San Francisco Foundation and Nonprofit Organizations With Joint Oversight from the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and Human Rights Commission

Purpose	Description	Nonprofit Organization	Amount	Impact
Emergency	\$500 will be paid	Bay Area Community Resources	\$1,555,000	Up to 1,555 families
Family Relief	to families, or residents with	Central American Resource Center—San Francisco	\$100,000	Up to 100 families
Fund	children 18 and	Chinese for Progressive Action	\$750,000	Up to 750 families
	younger, affected by the COVID-19	Coleman Advocates (Excelsior Works!)	\$200,000	Up to 200 families
	pandemic who	Collective Impact	\$50,000	50 to 100 families
	do not qualify for	Community Youth Center of San Francisco	\$750,000	Up to 750 families
	federal benefits.	Dolores Street Community Services	\$150,000	Up to 150 families
		Tenderloin Housing Clinic (La Voz Latina SF)	\$100,000	Up to 100 families
		Mission Economic Development Agency	\$850,000	Up to 850 families
		Young Community Developers	\$379,000	379 to 758 families
		Total	\$4,884,000	
Right to Recover	Eligible low- income workers who have COVID-	Mission Economic Development Agency	\$900,000	Up to 711 workers
Program	19 will receive two weeks of wage	Young Community Developers	\$900,000	Up to 711 workers
	replacement or \$1,285, based on	Self-Help for the Elderly	\$100,000	Up to 79 workers
	San Francisco's hourly minimum wage.	Central City Hospitality House ^a	\$100,000	Up to 79 workers
		Total	\$2,000,000	

^a Grant agreements between the San Francisco Foundation and nonprofit organizations are in progress. All others have been executed, and the funds have been disbursed to nonprofit organizations.

Exhibit 10: Uses, Impacts, and Grant Status for Programs Funded by Grant Agreements Between the San Francisco Foundation and Nonprofit Organizations With Oversight from the Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Purpose	Description	Nonprofit Organization	Amount	Impact
COVID-19 Related Grants and	1 33	MainStreet Launch ^a	\$1,500,000	At least 30 businesses to access no-interest loans of up to \$50,000
Loans for Small Businesses	and loan programs for small businesses affected by COVID- 19, including \$1,500,000 that has been allocated to the City's	Mission Economic Development Agency ^a	\$500,000	At least 10 businesses to access no-interest loans of up to \$50,000
	African-American Small Business Revolving Loan Fund.	To be determined ^b	\$1,000,000	To be quantified ^b
		Total	\$3,000,000	

^a Grant agreements between the San Francisco Foundation and nonprofit organizations are in progress.

^b Program/service delivery is in the planning phase. Grantees and impacts will be reported in subsequent reports.

^b Program/service delivery is in the planning phase. Grantees and impacts will be reported in subsequent reports.

In-Kind Donations

The Ninth Supplement, dated April 10, 2020, revised and replaced Item 4 in the Second Supplement to authorize the acceptance and use of goods donated to support the City's COVID-19 response efforts. The Twenty-Sixth Supplement, dated August 26, 2020, authorizes the acceptance and use of goods and facilities to support youth programs. Some donated goods are received by the Logistics Section of the COVID Command Center (formerly Emergency Operations Center). Other in-kind goods have been donated directly to city departments for their use.

Through August 28, 2020:

- 1,400,108 units of in-kind goods have been donated to and received by Give2SF, with a donation value of \$3,461,668.
- 1,115,097 units have been distributed to city departments by the COVID Command Center's Logistics Section.

Exhibit 11 summarizes this information, including valuation by category of donated goods. An attachment to this memorandum shows the individual donations received, including donor name, only for goods received through the COVID Command Center (and excludes individual donations received by departments directly for their own use).

Exhibit 11: In-Kind Donations Received by Give2SF and Distributed by the Logistics Section of the COVID Command Center

Category	Count Received	Count Distributed*
Aprons	429	0
Coveralls	14,603	1,743
Face Shields	3,109	1,887
Gloves	526,400	525,600
Goggles	3,362	3,362
Gowns	5,350	350
Hand Sanitizer	952	934
Liquid Disinfectant	302	0
Masks	635,933	511,053
Other Bulk Items	94,882	67,382
Shoe Covers	113,800	1,800
Wipes	986	986
Total	1,400,108	1,115,097

^{*} Excludes goods purchased and distributed by the COVID Command Center's Logistics Section. Source: COVID Command Center, Logistics Section

Sunshine Ordinance Compliance: Financial Interests and Disclosure of True Sources of Donations

The Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67) requires the disclosure of the true source of the donation to the City and any financial interest the donor has involving the City. However, some donations received by Give2SF, both directly and through the San Francisco Foundation, were from donors who wish to remain anonymous.

The Controller's Office is following up with donors to try to learn the true source of the anonymous donations to the City and any financial interest the donor may have involving the City. Due to these ongoing efforts, one donor-advised fund, Fidelity Charitable, has agreed to no longer process grants to the City from donors who wish to remain anonymous, and another donor-advised fund, Schwab Charitable, confirmed that it is the true donor for all donations it processes once funds are in its possession. The City Attorney accepts this interpretation, so no donations from Schwab Charitable are considered to be anonymous.

To date, only 12 donations (\$111,100 of \$7,667,686) directly received by Give2SF were made anonymously, 10 of which were made through donor-advised funds. The Controller's Office reached out to all donor-advised funds regarding anonymous donations that they handled and that the City received to inform them of city law and respectfully request the donors' names and financial interest confirmations. Regarding the 10 anonymous donations made through donor-advised funds:

- 7 funds have not responded to the Controller's Office's request for information.
- 2 funds confirmed that the donors wish to remain anonymous.
- 1 fund did not provide contact information when providing the donation because the fund received it via electronic wire transfer and no contact information is publicly available.

The Controller's Office has also reached out to all donors requesting financial interests. To date, 14 donors responded to the Controller's Office request to confirm they do not have a financial interest with the City and 2 donors have confirmed a financial interest in the form of a permit. These donors are identified in the relevant attachment.

The Controller's Office is working collaboratively with the San Francisco Foundation to obtain donor names and financial interests when possible and determine which donors wish to remain anonymous. To date, only 51 donations (\$57,576 of \$20,950,441) through the San Francisco Foundation were made anonymously, both through donor-advised funds and corporate giving programs. Due to these ongoing efforts:

- For donations made through its website, the San Francisco Foundation has added to its website a statement that the Give2SF Fund cannot accept anonymous donations.
- For donations made at the San Francisco Foundation through donor-advised funds where the donor requests anonymity, the Foundation will inform donors that it cannot process anonymous donations and will decline the donations.
- For donations made through corporate-giving platforms, such as Benevity Community Impact Fund, the San Francisco Foundation does not have control, so individual donors may still be anonymous.

11 | Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund Monthly Status Update August 31, 2020

None of the in-kind donors are anonymous. Two donors of goods have confirmed that they have a financial interest with the City in the form of a contract with one or more city departments. These donors are identified in the relevant attachment.

Policy Options for Anonymous Give2SF Donations Received

Due to either the absence of a response or the explicit refusal of some donors to disclose their identity and possible financial interest with the City, the Controller's Office cannot report on this information and is seeking policymaker guidance on next steps. For example, the Board of Supervisors may move to accept these donations while acknowledging the outreach and identification efforts taken by the Controller's Office to obtain donor information. Alternatively, the Board may order the return of the anonymous donations for which the information required by the Sunshine Ordinance cannot be obtained. Until the Controller's Office receives guidance from policymakers, the Controller's Office will retain amounts equivalent to the value of anonymous donations.

Should you need additional information, please contact me at <u>ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org</u> or (415) 554-7500.

Attachments

- Give2SF Monetary Donations Received
- Give2SF In-Kind Donations Received

8/28/2020 8/28/2020	Donor Name Total Through August 28, 2020		Directly by Give2SF		Through	Financial Interest With the City
8/28/2020	Total Through August 28, 2020		Give2SF			
8/28/2020	lotal Through August 28, 2020	*		+	SF Foundation	
8/28/2020		\$	7,667,685.84	\$	20,950,440.73	Di I
	Christos Bastis	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Phillip Ai	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Stephanie Su	\$	2,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Madison Fishstrom	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
., ,	William Chen	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
-,,	Melinda Weston	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
., ,	Austen Head and Lauren Chircus	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
	Chris Jones and Martina Jones	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
	Ceilidh McElroy	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/19/2020	Asna Ansari	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/18/2020	Spencer Simonsen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/18/2020	Ricky A Yee	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/17/2020	Bradley Sharpe	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/17/2020	Sue Ni	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/17/2020	Peter Vliet	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/17/2020	Anonymous	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
8/13/2020	Ceilidh McElroy	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/13/2020	Mary Franklin	\$	6,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/11/2020	Amanda English	\$	60.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Susan Herzig & Paul Hertzmann	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Elizabeth Kondor and Jim Cole	\$	110.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Alyssa Young	\$	5.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Jeffrey D Weitzel	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Alejandro A Argueta	\$	35.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/10/2020	Rozelle Lee	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
8/10/2020	Chris Jones and Martina Jones	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
8/7/2020	Laurie A Schryver	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/6/2020	Miss Victoria A R Carter	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
8/6/2020	Colin Mckeehan	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Judith M Coulter	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Jeff Holder and L.E.K. Consulting	\$	700.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
-, -,	Andrea Snow	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Rachel Goldman	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Lawrence Hosken	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Chloe Hill	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Anonymous	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
8/3/2020	James Robert Kennedy, Jr & Linda Ann Cicero	\$	2,500.00	\$	-	Donor has pending construction permit with San Francisco Planning
8/3/2020	Michael Kiehl	\$	-	\$	105.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
	Garima Jajoo	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	James P. Dowling	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Gregory E Finch	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/30/2020	Airbnb Inc - Matching Gift Program (4 Donations)	\$	-	\$	1,600.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
				_		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/30/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	37.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/20/2020		+			27.50	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/30/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	37.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/20/2020	A	<i>t</i>		+	F0.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/30/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/20/2020	Apple Computer Inc	\$	_	\$	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/30/2020	Apple Computer, Inc.	Þ	-	Þ	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/30/2020	Blue Shield of California	\$	_	\$	50.00	· ·
7/30/2020	dive Shield of California	Þ	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	DocuCian	¢		÷	20.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/20/2020	DocuSign	\$	-	\$	20.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/30/2020						
	DocuSign	\$		\$	20.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial

-

Donation Amount								
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City		
7/30/2020	Dropbox	\$	GIVEZ3F	\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/30/2020	Бторьох	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Genentech, Inc.	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
., ,		1		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Greg Egan	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Heesun Lee	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Kiani Muhammad	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Robert Flory	\$	-	\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Selina Liu	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/30/2020	Twitter	\$	-	\$	822.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/29/2020	Roberts-Castiaux Charitable Fund	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/29/2020	Bharat Family Fund	\$	4,000.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/29/2020	Marian Beard and Daniel Wehmeier	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/29/2020	Vesuvio	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/29/2020	Eric Machado	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/29/2020	Oyindamola Ayo-Ani	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/29/2020	Howald Blake Fund	\$	-	\$	5,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/28/2020	Matthew White	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/28/2020	Miranda W Lai	\$	50.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/27/2020	Patricia T. Dusenbury	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/27/2020	Janice B Whang	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/27/2020	Mason Scott	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/27/2020	Atef Chaudhury	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/27/2020	Lorraine Thompson	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/27/2020	Anita Y Cheng	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/27/2020	Alexandra K Lee	\$	50.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/23/2020	Maria Amundson and Elliot Krane	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/22/2020	Anonymous Through New Year Fund	\$	1,000.00	7	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/22/2020	William G Graham	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/21/2020 7/21/2020	Dietz_Zeyliger Jennie Kajiko	\$	2,000.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure's will be requested by Q1 of F12020-21 Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/21/2020	Sheryl Ruskin	\$	200.00 150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/21/2020	Jesse and Roberta Fink	\$	99.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Sean Curran	\$	15,000.00			Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/20/2020	Diane and Carl Shannon	\$	10,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Navin Iyengar and Nichiketa Choudhary	\$	5,000.00	+		Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/20/2020	Ellie Rossiter	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
7/20/2020	Polly Rose	\$	200.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Frank J Leykamm	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Brooke Babcock	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Valued Cardholder	\$	75.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/20/2020	Sophie Goodwin	\$	18.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
7/17/2020	Google Inc Matching Gift Program (15 Donations)	\$	-	\$	2,925.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
,,		1		7	_,	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/16/2020	Jason Hicks	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
,		1		'	22.30	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/16/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
, ,,	,	1			30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/16/2020	Simon Rogers	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
	- 3	7		-	25.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
		11				interest disclosure reducits with si i bundation		
7/16/2020	Natalia Fisher	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by Give2SF	IAI	Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
7/16/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Natalia Fisher	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Todd Kerpelman	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Todd Kerpelman	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	David Chen	\$	-	\$	1,500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Paige Stoermer	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/16/2020	Simon Rogers	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/15/2020	Sy Aal	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/14/2020	Nhung T Nhu	\$	35.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/13/2020	Mason Scott	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/13/2020	Jacob Topper	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/10/2020	David Solow-Cordero	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/10/2020	Lyon Lay	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/10/2020	Tira Sims	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/8/2020	Cotton the First Shirtmaker	\$	1,200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/8/2020	Mr. and Mrs. Jeff Richards	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
7/8/2020	Scott Stryker	\$	400.00	\$	_	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
7/8/2020	Lindsay Schauer	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
7/8/2020	Stuart W Campbell	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/8/2020	Tiffany Chu	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/7/2020	GIC Real Estate, Inc.	\$	3,796.17	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/7/2020	Bryr Studio	\$	425.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/7/2020	Amanda English	\$	46.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	Formagrid Inc. dba Airtable	\$	5,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	Philippe Farhi	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	E Max Koenker	\$	470.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	Chris J and Elizabeth A Lane	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
7/6/2020	Elizabeth Kondor and Jim Cole	\$	110.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	Kimberly Low	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/6/2020	Gunderson Dettmer	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
7/3/2020	Joshua Goldstein and Glynnis Fowler	\$	250.00	+ -	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/3/2020	Angelina Huang	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/2/2020	Anthony Wu	\$	325.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
7/2/2020	Adobe Systems Incorporated	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		*		7		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Airbnb Inc	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
17272020	All brib inc	Ψ		Ψ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Airbnb Inc	\$		\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
1/2/2020	Allohome	Ψ		Ψ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Alejandra Dominguez	\$		\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
1/2/2020	Alejandra Dominguez	Φ		Ф	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Andrea Chauset	đ		đ	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/2/2020	Andrea Stewart	\$	-	\$	100.00	3
7/2/2020	A	<i>a</i>		4	25.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7 /2 /2000					50.55	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	62.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	35.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	12.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

			Donatio	n Amo	unt			
Gift Date	Donor Name		ectly by ve2SF	CE	Through Foundation	Financial Interest With the City		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1,2,2020	Allohymous	Ψ		Ψ	23.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1,2,2020	ritoriyinous	Ψ		Ψ	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	20.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Allonymous	Ψ		Ψ	20.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ψ		Ψ	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$		\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ψ		Ψ	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$		\$	12.50			
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ф		Ф	12.30	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Ananymaus	\$		\$	125.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ф	-	Þ	123.00	_		
7/2/2020	An an image	\$		\$	12.50	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	Þ	12.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7/2/2020	A company of the comp	t.		¢	350.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7 10 10 00 0				+	10.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	10.00	3		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	12.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	72.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	0.50	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
	·					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
	,					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	10.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
		,		ľ		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
., _,		7		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	_	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
17272020	Allohymous	Ψ		Ψ	23.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$		\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Ananymous	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	ф	-	Ф	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Ananymaus	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Anonymous	Ф	-	Þ	100.00	3		
7/2/2020	A construction	t.		¢	1 400 00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	1,400.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7/0/0000	Drive De Hay	<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>	25.25	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Brian Radley	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7 10 15 2 2 :				+		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Caitlyn Lai-Valenti	\$	-	\$	125.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Cutter MacLeod	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Darcey Addicks	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		

			Donatio	n Am	ount			
Gift Date Donor Name	Name Directly by Through Give2SF SF Foundation				Financial Interest With the City			
7/2/2020	Dolby	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Donna Ruane	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Don Winkler	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Genentech, Inc.	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
., _,		Ť		7		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Genentech, Inc.	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,	Generation, inc.	4		4	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Genentech, Inc.	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1,2,2020	deficitedly inc.	Ψ		Ψ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Genentech, Inc.	\$		\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Generitecti, inc.	Ф	_	Ф	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Cappala Dadriguas	\$		\$	100.00	,		
7/2/2020	Gonzalo Rodriguez	Þ	-	Þ	100.00	3		
7 10 10 00 0	0.110	+		_	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Griff Potrock	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Griff Potrock	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Guillaume Forget	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Jaime Gobert	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Jarod Reyes	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
	,					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Jeremy Hageman	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
,, _, _,	seremy riageman	4		4		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Jessica Owen	\$		\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Jessica Oweri	Ф		Ф	25.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Johanna Merino	\$		\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Johanna Menno	Φ	-	Þ	23.00	_		
7/2/2020	Luckin Cai	\$		\$	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Justin Cai	Þ	-	Þ	100.00	9		
7 10 10 00 0	V. II. D	+		_	250.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Kelly Pretzer	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Kelly Vedder	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Kerri Ryusaki	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	KKR	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Kurt Forsgren	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	LendingClub	\$	-	\$	10.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Lina Smith	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
, _,		Ť		7		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	LinkedIn	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1,2,2020	Enredin	Ψ		Ψ	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	LinkedIn	\$		\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Linkediii	Ψ		Ψ	73.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Linksollo	4		đ	200.00			
7/2/2020	LinkedIn	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7/2/2020	Maria Diagra	*		+	25.25	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Maya Rioux	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
		1.				interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Michelle Jefferson	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Michelle Spanne	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Mike Zuehlke	\$		\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7/2/2020	IVIRE Zuerike	Ψ.				3		

			Donation	n Amour	nt			
Gift Date	Donor Name		rectly by	1	Through	Financial Interest With the City		
7/2/2020	Netflix	\$	Give2SF -	\$	2,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Netilix	Φ	_	Þ	2,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Nick Chavez	\$		\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	NICK CHavez	\$	-	Þ	25.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Okta	\$		\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	Okta	\$	-	Þ	150.00	_		
7/2/2020	D 1	4		<i>t</i>	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Paypal	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
		_		_		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Pedro Velarde	\$	-	\$	30.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	PEIYING MA	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Quan Trong	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Rachel Corral	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Ripple	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Robert Flory	\$	_	\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
., _,	,	Ť		*		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Robert Lucero	\$	_	\$	2,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1,2,2020	Nobel Eddelo	,		Ψ	2,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Rob Haynes	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/2/2020	NOD Hayries	, and the second		Ψ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Rob Haynes	\$	_	\$	200.00			
7/2/2020	Rob Haynes	\$	-	Þ	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7/2/2020	D.H. C	<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>	450.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Ruthann Gore	\$	-	\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7 10 10 00 0					222.22	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Samy Hernandez	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
7 10 10 00 0	6 M				50.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Scotty Nowak	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Shaun Bowen	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Tony Pauker	\$	-	\$	90.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Twitter	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Tyler Devlin	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Vickrum Singh	\$	-	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Visa, Inc.	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Visa, Inc.	\$	-	\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
				·		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Visa, Inc.	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
. ,	,	ľ			. 30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Yeneneh Awage	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
., _, _ 0_0	- Indiana in age	Ψ		¥	50.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/2/2020	Zillow Group	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
1/4/4040	Zillow Group	•	-	ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
7/1/2020	Ardian HC Foundation	*	12 000 00	đ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7/1/2020	Ardian US Foundation	\$	12,000.00		-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21		
6/30/2020	Matthew Jee	\$	2,000.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
6/29/2020	Mason Scott	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
6/29/2020	Lindsay Schapiro and Adam Brudnick	\$	50.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
6/26/2020	Nisit Jirangpitakkul	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		

Company Comp		Donation Amount					
Gov.	Gift Date	Donor Name			IA		Financial Interest With the City
Application Section	Girt Dute	Donor Name					Thanela merest with the eley
VASCECADE Services Fings \$ 1,000 \$ 0 Sinchaure equated reporte profing VASCECADE VASCE	6/26/2020	Ashley Moore	\$		\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
Section Sect			+		÷	-	
\$4,042,000 Samsaria					ı.	_	
Self-2022020 Amy Protection Section of Apparel			-		·		
\$2,000 S			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	_	
6.023/0020 John Moore			+		<u> </u>		
50220020 September Septe			+		<u> </u>		
Parabase Charitable Funda a Droor Advised Fund of Prizo20-21			<u> </u>		÷		-
Renaissance Charlable Foundation					·		1 7 -
	0/22/2020		Þ	7,300.00	Þ	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of F12020-21
Sezzence Sezence Sezzence Sezence Sezzence Sezence	C /22 /2020		đ	1,000,00	đ		Disabatura rasusatad raspansa pandina
522,02002 Janet C. Waite \$ 1,000.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 5,022,0200 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$			+		<u> </u>		
622/2020 Anonymous Principh Fidelity Charitable \$ 500.00 \$ -			<u> </u>		÷		
602/2002 Frank and Carolyn Holek-Van Orden			-		Ė		
5622/2002 Devint Ten-New Cheng and Marjory J. Richards \$ \$30.00 \$ Decisioures will be requested by Q1 of PY2020-21			-		<u> </u>	-	7
5.22,002 Davies Dam			-		<u> </u>	-	
Sez22000 Linda Joan Saraf \$ 200.00 \$ -			-		·		
			<u> </u>		+	-	
			+		÷	-	-
			-		<u> </u>	-	
					<u> </u>	-	7
	6/22/2020	Sephora USA, Inc.	-	100.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
	6/22/2020	Ramaswamy Srikant	\$	50.00	\$	-	9
	6/22/2020	Adobe Inc.	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
Interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	6/22/2020	Kenneth M. Ashford	\$	45.00	\$	-	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21
Section Sect	6/22/2020	Dropbox	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
Semigrage Semi							interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/19/2020 Ren Zotto S 1,000.00 S Disclosure requested, response pending	6/19/2020	Mark Brody	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
6/19/2020	6/19/2020	Jennifer Perini	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/19/2020 Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable \$ 250.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 The Johnslington Fund \$ 200.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 Agrey J. Clark \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/19/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Siran Borromeo \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Shryas R Gandhi \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Apple Computer, Inc Matching Gift Program (3 Donations) \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	6/19/2020	Ben Zotto	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
Formation Section Se	6/19/2020	Arlene Waksberg, Charles M Clark	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
Formation Section Se	6/19/2020	Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
Social Control Social Renaker Social Control Social Control Response pending			\$	200.00	\$	-	
Second			\$	100.00	\$	-	
6/19/2020 Patricia Mahoney \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/18/2020 Vesuvio Cafe \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Shreyas R Gandhi \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Shreyas R Gandhi \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/16/2020 Apple Computer, Inc Matching Gift Program (3 Donations) \$ - \$ 850.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Comcast \$ - \$ 500,000 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Gilead Sciences, Inc. \$ - \$ 500,000 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Google Inc Matching Gift Program (3 Donations) \$ - \$ 500,000 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Google Inc Matching Gift Program (3 Donations) \$ - \$ 6,425.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Netflix - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations) \$ - \$ 3,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Matches Munz \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested	6/19/2020		\$	100.00	\$	-	
6/18/2020 Vesuvio Cafe \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending	6/19/2020		\$	50.00	\$	-	
Since Sina Borromeo Since Sinc			+		÷	-	
Shreyas R Gandhi Shreyas R Shreyas R Shoundation Shreyas R Gandhi Shreyas R Shreyas R Shoundation Shreyas R Shoundation Shreyas R			+		÷	-	
Apple Computer, Inc Matching Gift Program (3 Donations) Comcast S S S S S Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor f			\$		\$	-	
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Comcast \$ - \$ 25,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Gilead Sciences, Inc. \$ - \$ 500,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Google Inc Matching Gift Program (33 Donations) \$ - \$ 6,425.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Netflix - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations) \$ - \$ 3,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Matchew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherry \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending		,			<u> </u>	850.00	
Commonst Sample	0, 10, 2020		,		1		,
Silead Sciences, Inc. Soundation Sound	6/16/2020	Comcast	¢	_	¢	25,000,00	
6/16/2020 Gilead Sciences, Inc. \$ - \$ 500,000.0 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Google Inc Matching Gift Program (33 Donations) \$ - \$ 6,425.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Netflix - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations) \$ - \$ 3,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Matthew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez	0,10,2020	Cornease	Ψ		Ψ	23,000.00	9
Interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	6/16/2020	Giland Sciences Inc	¢		¢	500,000,00	
6/16/2020 Google Inc Matching Gift Program (33 Donations) \$ - \$ 6,425.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Netflix - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations) \$ - \$ 3,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Matthew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ 5,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez	0/10/2020	dilead Sciences, inc.	Ψ		Ψ	300,000.00	9
Interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	6/16/2020	Google Inc. Matching Gift Program (22 Departions)	¢		¢	6 425 00	
Second Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	0/10/2020	Google Inc Matching Gift Program (33 Donations)	Ф	_	ф	0,423.00	•
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Matthew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending	C (1C /2020	Notflin Matching Cift Program (2 Danctions)	đ		ď	2,000,00	•
6/16/2020 Dolby \$ - \$ 200,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/16/2020 Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/15/2020 Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Matthew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending	6/16/2020	Netflix - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations)	>	-	>	3,000.00	
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00	C 41C 12020	Deller	4		đ	200,000,00	
Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations) \$ - \$ 7,675.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	6/16/2020	Dolby	\$	-	\$	200,000.00	9
Interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation			_				•
6/15/2020Jack Douglas and Kelly Morton\$ 500.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/15/2020Matthew Munz\$ 200.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/15/2020Mason Scott\$ 150.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/15/2020Leslie Wellbaum\$ 100.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/15/2020Boris Cherny\$ 50.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/12/2020Mike Grisso and Grace Park\$ 1,000.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/12/2020Patrick Family Fund\$ -\$ 5,000.00Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation6/11/2020Reynaldo L. Pantaleon\$ 25.00-Disclosure requested, response pending6/10/2020Samuel Valdez\$ 500.00-Disclosure requested, response pending	6/16/2020	Simon Rogers - Matching Gift Program (35 Donations)	\$	-	\$	7,675.00	
6/15/2020 Matthew Munz \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending							
6/15/2020 Mason Scott \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					÷		-
6/15/2020 Leslie Wellbaum \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			-		<u> </u>		
6/15/2020 Boris Cherny \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			-		+		
6/12/2020 Mike Grisso and Grace Park \$ 1,000.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					<u> </u>	-	
6/12/2020 Patrick Family Fund \$ - \$ 5,000.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			+		+	-	
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			+	1,000.00	-		
6/11/2020 Reynaldo L. Pantaleon \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending	6/12/2020	Patrick Family Fund	\$	-	\$	5,000.00	
6/10/2020 Samuel Valdez \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending							
	6/11/2020	Reynaldo L. Pantaleon	\$	25.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/10/2020 Ira Fateman and Jobeth Walt \$ 500.00 \$ - Disclosure requested response pending	6/10/2020	Samuel Valdez	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
, , ,	6/10/2020	Ira Fateman and Jobeth Walt	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation		
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by	Through	Financial Interest With the City
C /0 /2020	Origina Inc	\$	Give2SF	SF Foundation	Displaceurs will be requested by O1 of EV2020 21
6/9/2020 6/8/2020	Origina, Inc. Matt Beaumont-Gay	\$	596.80 10,000.00	\$ -	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-21 Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Michael J McGinley	\$	1,200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Josh and Meredith Bauer	\$	318.50	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Peter Kinmond	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$		*	
6/8/2020	Pilates In Common Cooperative Inc	\$	176.85	¥	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Anne Fuchs-Chesney		54.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Jennifer Lin	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020	Philip A Reitz	\$	20.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	John Cuffney	\$	1,500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Kristin Anundsen	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Todd Rydstrom and Mike Dickman	\$	500.00	\$ -	Employee
6/5/2020	andrew and Nancy Leahy	\$	300.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Russell Thau	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	John J Beam	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Elizabeth Kondor & Jim Cole	\$	110.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Blue Beyond Consulting, Inc	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/5/2020	Patricia Wise	\$	25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	Matthew Jee	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	Lili Byers and Peter Straus	\$	300.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	Tom Budgick	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	Jacob Ostrofsky	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	Bruce Parker	\$	30.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/4/2020	AT&T	\$	-	\$ 100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		,			interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/3/2020	Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable	\$	2,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/3/2020	Jenny Nguyen and Friends	\$	600.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/3/2020	Sarah Owens	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/3/2020	L. R. Ingersoll	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/3/2020	 	\$	100.00	\$ -	
	Sigma Computing	\$	30.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/3/2020	I M Thomson	-		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Tess Winlock and Christine Luu	\$	40,000.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Kimberly Low	\$	1,200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Brandon Schwartz	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable	\$	400.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Jo Ann Ogden	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Francesca C Vera	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Hung Family	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Lisel Joseph	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/2/2020	Ashley B Macy	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	William W. Atkins	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Robert K. Deel	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Jesse A Guzman	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Tommy Lin	\$	300.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	India C Prentice	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$	237.81	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Alina C Lodahl	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Mason Scott	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Sasha Cuttler RN and Lauren Cuttler RN	\$	180.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Colin McKeehan	\$	150.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Tap Tap Organics	\$	112.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Anna Mae Abia	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Sy Aal	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Jeffrey R Rigo	\$	100.00		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Sophie Diao	\$	100.00	· ·	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
	- '	\$			
6/1/2020	Arjun Krishna Kumar		75.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Kevin Gao	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Cindy Changar	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Carolyn Yao	\$	15.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
6/1/2020	Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP	\$	-	\$ 50.00	3
-, ,				i e	Programme and the programme an
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Akshay Sethi	\$	-	\$ 100.00	

			Donatio	n Am	ount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation		Financial Interest With the City
6/1/2020	Alex Song	\$	-	\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Ali Miller	\$	_	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Amita Gajewar	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anna Ramon	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	20.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	20,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
				_		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
C 14 10 00 0		+			100000	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
C 14 12020		+		+	25.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Anonymous	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
C 14 10 00 0	1 1 6 1 1 11 11 6 6 7 11 1	+			20.040.20	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Apple Computer, Inc Matching Gift Program (17 Donations)	\$	-	\$	20,212.32	3
C /1 /2020	Deniancia Turner	\$		\$	1,000,00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
6/1/2020	Benjamin Turner	Ъ	-	Þ	1,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Blue Shield of California	\$		\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	blue Stilletu of California	Φ		Þ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Brandon Holt	\$		\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	Brandom Hole	Ψ		Ψ.	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Casey Madden	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 1, 2020	casey madden	Ψ		1	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Christian Wofford	\$	_	\$	2,500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					,	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Christian Wofford	\$	-	\$	2,500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Craig Stout	\$	_	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Daniel Kuo	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Derek Ryan	\$	-	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Elizabeth Juenger	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Elizabeth Perakis	\$	-	\$	40.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Eric Gourlaouen	\$	-	\$	226.16	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Genentech, Inc Matching Gift Program (9 Donations)	\$	-	\$	1,470.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Google Inc Matching Gift Program (20 Donations)	\$	-	\$	8,866.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Guillaume Forget	\$	-	\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Heather Moore	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
l	1	1		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

			Donatio	n Am	ount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
6/1/2020	Ivan Tanasic	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Jheel Doshi	\$	-	\$	49.25	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Jonathan Grobstein	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					,	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Julianne McGoldrick	\$	_	\$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-, .,		-		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Julie Nishihara	\$	_	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Katie Shih	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Kristen Stotts	\$	_	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-, -,		-		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Lauren Fernandez	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 1, 2020	Edd of Fernande2	4		,	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Lee Newman	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/ 1/2020	Lee Newman	Ψ		J	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	LinkedIn - Matching Gift Program (4 Donations)	\$		\$	370.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	Linkedin - Matching Girt Frogram (4 Donations)	Ф		Φ	370.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Marc Franklin	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	IVIAIC FIAIIKIIII	Ф	-	Þ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Missocoft Matching Cift December (2 Depotions)	\$		\$	1,100.00	·
0/1/2020	Microsoft - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations)	Þ	-	Þ	1,100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
- 4 (2020	AC LT				02.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Nick Turner	\$	-	\$	83.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
. 44 (2020	No. 1				200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Nintendo	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Nitin Nitin	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	NVIDIA - Matching Gift Program (4 Donations)	\$	-	\$	700.00	3
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Oath Inc	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Patrick Wynn	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Piper Sandler Companies	\$	-	\$	350.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Playstation Cares - Matching Gift Program (2 Donations)	\$	-	\$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Robert Broesler	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Rob Haynes	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Sabrine Rekik	\$	-	\$	290.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Sabrine Rekik	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Samuel Kaminsky	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Sandeep Chandna	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	·					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Sarah DeMarois	\$	-	\$	40.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		'		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Shalin Mantri	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
., ., _ 0 _ 0		1		,	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Stefan Reich	\$		\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
J, 1, LULU	State Holeit	۳		Ψ.	230.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Theodore Crockin	\$		\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
J, 1/ LULU	THEOGOTE CLOCKIT	φ	-	Ф	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	The Omidvar Group	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
)/ I/ZUZU	The Omidyar Group	Φ	-	Þ	100.00	_
	I and the second			1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

	Donor Name		Donation	ı Am	ount	
Gift Date			Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
6/1/2020	Todd Kerpelman	\$	GIVEZ3F	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	rodd Kerpelman	Ψ		Ψ	250.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Todd Kerpelman	\$	_	\$	450.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-, ,		"				interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	TPG	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		,		Ů		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Wen-Ting Tsai	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 1, 2020	Trem mig 15an	,		Ÿ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Workday	\$	_	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 1, 2020		,		Ÿ	23.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Xylem Inc.	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0,1,2020	Aylem me.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Xylem Inc.	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	Aylem me.	Ψ		Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Zillow Group	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0/1/2020	Zillow Group	J		Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/29/2020	Arthur and Toni Rembe Rock	\$	500,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Ardian US LLC	\$	15,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
				<u> </u>		, , , , ,
5/29/2020	Nicholas Reavill and Emily Wolahan	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
5/29/2020	James and Sheryl Reuben	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
5/29/2020	Jennifer Braun and Raymond J Ryan	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
5/29/2020	Onebeacon Insurance Group	\$	2,100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Robert Fearing	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Cary J Fleisher	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Judith Tornese	\$	300.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
5/29/2020	Wesley Wiley and Janice Kendall	\$	200.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
5/29/2020	Heath Massey	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Connie J Mar	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Karen and Leon Traister	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Camille Lejeune	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Sheldon Kirchman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Frances Ohashi	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Leonard Torres	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	Trisha Thadani	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/29/2020	David L. Klein, Jr. Fund	\$	-	\$	7,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/29/2020	Tung Family Fund	\$	-	\$	2,500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	J ,					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/29/2020	Dara Khosrowshahi	\$	-	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					,	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/29/2020	Susan Pritzker	\$	_	\$	250,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-,,		"		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/28/2020	Andrew Work	\$	426.50	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/28/2020	Louis Derosa	\$	100.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/28/2020	James Christie	\$	100.00	<u> </u>	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/28/2020	Rachelle Axel	\$	75.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/28/2020	Brenda Tucker	\$	25.00	¢		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Steve and Dianne Leonoudakis	\$	800.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020		\$		-		
	Jason Pellegrini		500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Crunchbase Inc.	\$	500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Morris Family	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Rebecca Herman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Gretchen M Ehrenkaufer	\$	50.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/27/2020	Iran Narges	\$	25.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Bigote De Gato/Teatro Tin Tan	\$	5,000.00	1	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Rosa Birch	\$	1,500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Julia Lopez	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Lauren MacGuidwin	\$	500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Golden Gate Trauma and Marriage Counseling	\$	400.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Erin Bailey	\$	297.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Alison Dame-Boyle	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Carmen Chu	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
			200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending

C'U D	2	Donation	ı A		
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
5/26/2020	Pilates In Common Cooperative, Inc.	\$ 182.40	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Bruce Johnson	\$ 150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Blair G Helsing	\$ 150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Colin McKeehan	\$ 150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Vivian Fong	\$ 120.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Antonia I Ruiz	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Evelyn Kelsey	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Thomas X Bockmon	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Stephanie Schneider	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Robin Morales	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	Cassandra McGoldrick	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	David and Katherine Dewilde	\$ 10,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Al Crowell	\$ 1,200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Susan Rosen	\$ 250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Matthew B Bohm	\$ 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Julia A Pak	\$ 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Richard L Suen	\$ 125.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Ashesha Mehrotra	\$ 101.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Kathleen White	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Susan G. Van	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Lan V Liem	\$ 281.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Marian Halley	\$ 200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Richard Lesnick	\$ 200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Teresa Feng	\$ 100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Leuwam Tesfai	\$ 100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Charles Perl and Ted Nguyen	\$ 100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Brenda Tucker, SF Travel	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Valeria Wilson	\$ 50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/21/2020	Cynthia Gregory	\$ 50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Donal and Nancy Duffy	\$ 200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Stephen Garber and Rena Pasick	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Rachel Lim	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Denise Selleck	\$ 100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Antonio Gurgel	\$ 50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Kristin Tieche	\$ 20.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/20/2020	Allison C Vicencio	\$ 10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Pj Crowell, Gold Bloc Artist Collective	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Tiffany Huang	\$ 600.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Michael K Truong	\$ 500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Diana R Meistrell	\$ 300.00	7		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	John Melichar	\$ 250.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Taylor M McNair	\$ 100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Kawanna Jenkins	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/19/2020	Chris Wojcicki	\$ 12.00	·		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Box Inc. Fund	\$ 62,500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Victor C B Smith	\$ 	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		\$ 20,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Nehal and Jenny Fan Raj Fund	\$ 10,000.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Christopher H Lord and Coltrane C. Lord	 10,000.00	-		1 7 1 1 3
5/18/2020	David Bloom	\$ 5,000.00	-		No financial interest with the City
5/18/2020	James L Kilgore	\$ 5,000.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Christian Topham	\$ 2,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Stephanie Sun	\$ 2,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Bianca Doerschlag	\$ 1,200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Andrew R Hutchinson	\$ 1,200.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Levin Family Foundation	\$ 1,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Mark Leno	\$ 1,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Tamisie Vrolyk	\$ 1,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Hannah Krier	\$ 1,000.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Yesenia Lopez	\$ 1,000.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Claire R Fram	\$ 600.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Samantha Steele	\$ 500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Anton Herasymenko	\$ 500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Clara J Jeffery	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	1 A	mount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
			Give2SF		SF Foundation	
5/18/2020	Bradley Collins	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Thomas Van Dyck	\$	500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Chris Farrell	\$	400.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Adam Shaywitz	\$	318.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Yesenia Lopez and Brian Reynoso	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$	237.81	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Stephen Heide	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Bonnie M. Moffett / Eugene V. Moffett	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Michael Silverman	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Janelle Caywood	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Cynthia Lin, MD	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Mason Scott	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Cara Kritikos	\$	200.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Xuanthu Pham	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	JP Kempt Barber & Social	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	James and Jean Hardin	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Ian Solomon Charitable Fund	\$	180.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Betsy Eckstein and David Heller	\$	180.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Cynthia J Goguen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Audrey E. Groomes	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Robert Livingstone	\$	100.00	\$	1	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Yohana Mehari	\$	100.00	\$	1	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Bryan Wolf	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Blaine Bookey and Richard T. Walker	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Diane and Sam Sidd-Champion	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Xin Liu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Amy Wollman and Gerry Berkowitz	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Keith Hardaway	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Leah Jackson	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Peter L Vliet	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	David Kidd	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Scott McFadden	\$	40.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Jeffrey Briz-Felisilda	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Arnel Bautista and Family	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Derron Thweatt	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Barbara Komansky	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Billy R McFadden	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Deepak Kumar	\$	15.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Laurel Gaddie	\$	5.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/18/2020	Mark R. and Mauree Jane Perry	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
<u> </u>						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/15/2020	Joan Wendt	\$	2,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Stevana Case	\$	1,250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Amy Beinart and Gary A Marcus	\$	1,200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Holly French	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Cyrus Hall	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Stacy and Christiaan Vorkink	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Matthew Koontz	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Sarah Cohen and Peter Barschall	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Stuart L Silberman	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Kristin Henry	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Gurlyn Singh Grewal	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Margaret J Handler	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Harold Liss and Daniela Wellisz	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Stan and Monica Hayes	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Narayana Pappu	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Sloan Looney	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Anthony and Kathleen Jones	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020				_		
5/15/2020 5/15/2020		\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pendina
5/15/2020	Benjamin and Jessie Roodman Gareth J Hoo	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
	Benjamin and Jessie Roodman	-		\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by	n Amo	unt Through	Financial Interest With the City
			Give2SF	SF	Foundation	ĺ
5/15/2020	Anne K Gallagher	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Priya and Alex Clemens	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Carolyn Goossen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Alexandra Sweet	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Jacob Y Wang	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Marsha Obannon	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Jim Bolinger	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Lee Ryan and Nancy Aalberg	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Elizabeth Warner	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Sophie Goodwin	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Prayoonthong Familys	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Lester Logue	\$	15.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Susan Pritzker	\$	-	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/14/2020	The Miners	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Sheila Stuart	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Emily Johnston	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Tracy Freedman	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Bruce Colman	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Tristan Cameron	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Jonathan Cohen	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Andrew Dai	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Susan L Karp	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Rodman Rogers MD	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Paul A Allen	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Terri and Robert Ludden	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Stephen and Elizabeth Mangum	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Chana Greene	\$	450.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Thomas Hanley	\$	300.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Jan and Russ Potts	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Samuel M. Sobol	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Timothy Alan Simon, Esq.	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Kathryn Marple	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Caird Arbona Family	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Judith A Holm	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Gail M MacGowan	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	David E Babbitz	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Steven Kasapi	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Robert M Fruchtman	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Mary L Miller	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Jonathan A Funk	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Genevieve Mansfield	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Jacob G Wellins	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Charles T Whipple	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Charlotte L Johnson	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Gina Fromer	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020		\$	100.00	-	<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Deborah Fellinger	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020 5/14/2020	Cathy Rabin Diane C Carr	\$	100.00	-	<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Sarah Marie Smith	\$				Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Andrew Y Ong		100.00			
5/14/2020	Andrew Y Ong	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Michel Schoemaker	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Henry Milich	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Carlo Porter	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Catherine Cusic	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Eric Shaw	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Steve Bookbinder and Michelle Chan	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	David J Bloom	\$	69.00		-	No financial interest with the City
	Margaret Rubio	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	3	-		*		Di I
5/14/2020 5/14/2020 5/14/2020	Kathryn Claiborn Kirk Beckstead	\$	50.00 50.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donation Directly by	Amo	ount Through	Financial Interest With the City
		Give2SF		F Foundation	
5/14/2020	Erin Loback	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Nedra Dias	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Serapheim Dimitropoulos	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Arta Zygielbaum	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Jennie Parrilla and Family	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Gustave Feldman	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Sherrie Groshong	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Ariel Garcia De La Vega	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Laura L Munter	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Kevin Darling	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Alana Ronen	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Bradley Tanzman	\$ 12.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	Mark Barnes	\$ 10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Christine Beard	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Sandy Leung	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Michael J. Solomon	\$ 250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Winnie Ouyang	\$ 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Victor Lin	\$ 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Sonja R. Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Rachel Hill	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Ryan Nichols	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Jamie Nargassans	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Vincent Eckert	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Jamal Rayshaun Collins	\$ 10.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Caroline Cross	\$ 5.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/12/2020	Cotton The First Shirtmaker	\$ 600.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/12/2020	Margaret Wilson	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/12/2020	Meghan Kamat	\$ 70.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/12/2020	Selina Selina	\$ 25.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Wells Fargo Foundation	\$ 150,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Gale Mondry and Bruce Cohen	\$ 10,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Christopher John Rupright and Pamela G.H. Rupright	\$ 10,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	McMorgan & Company	\$ 7,500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Peter Vulgaris and Aimee Lucido	\$ 3,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Steven Chang	\$ 2,400.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Mark Watson and Clare Winterton	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Heather and Arturo Gonzalez	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Ripa Saha	\$ 501.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Stewart Murrie	\$ 500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
		 500.00	-		
5/11/2020	Ginger Lau	\$	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Ginger Lau	\$ 500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Thomas R. and Georgia L. Schuttish	\$ 300.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Marcella Vendrell	\$ 200.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Pilates In Common Cooperative, Inc.	\$ 189.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Iris Fung	\$ 150.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Elizabeth Kondor and Jim Cole	\$ 110.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Wai M Yee	\$ 100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Jason Greco	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Denise Powell	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Lorraine Thompson	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Daniel Hertz	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Eden Kfir	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Vivan Som	\$ 250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Margaret Hom	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Kerry Viengvilai	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Zarana K Udani	\$ 10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Chime, Inc.	\$ -	\$	75,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
				•	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/7/2020	Karthik Balaji	\$ 1,220.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/7/2020	James and Janet Respess	\$ 1,200.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
1-,.,====					
5/7/2020	Lauren M Harriman	\$ 500 00	- 8	_	Disclosure requested response pending
5/7/2020 5/7/2020	Lauren M Harriman Mary Mykhaylova	\$ 500.00 250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donatior Directly by Give2SF		nount Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
5/7/2020	Andrew Crebar	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/7/2020	Andrew Tremblay	\$	50.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/7/2020	Cary Bronstein	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/7/2020	Patrick Family Fund	\$	-	\$	5,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/6/2020	Amanda Schapel	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Drew Liming	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Timothy Hsu	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Stephanie Rose	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Jeannie Sun	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Erika Opper and James A Horton	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Robert Taine	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Abraham Mertens and Ivory Madison	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Adriana Grino	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Felicia Pitre	\$	25.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	#Start Small	\$	23.00	\$	15,000,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
5/6/2020	#Start Smail	\$	-	Þ	15,000,000.00	_
F /F /2020			2 000 00	+		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/5/2020	Heather and Gene Cutler	\$	2,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	GGV Capital	\$	1,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Sherry Coveney	\$	1,200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Addison Luria-Roberson	\$	120.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Ken Irelan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Shuchita Mishra	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	James and Rosalind Johnson	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Jesse M King	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Laurel Kilgour	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Divya M Patel	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Google, LLC	\$	500,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Lifschultz-Stiepleman Family	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Rhisa C Muse	\$	3,041.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Pagoda Arts Laser Cutting	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Robert Pooley	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	The Boudreau Ma Family	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	David N Goldman	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Charles Magahern	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Jonathon M Grist	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	The Yunger Family	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Telegraph Hill Software	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	3		400.00	-		1 1 1 3
	Jonathan B Hernandez	\$		_		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	George H. Rey		300.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Andrew Vernon	\$	300.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Cotton The First Shirtmaker	\$	300.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Chris Lesch	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Alexa Hansen	\$	250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Owen G Auch	\$	250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$	237.80	 	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Wilson J Lam/Mary Leong Lam	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Kathy McCormick	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Tiffany Edwards	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Colin McKeehan	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	GIC	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Nordlund Family	\$	101.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Michael Macia	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Daphne Wray	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	H. Kamimoto	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Darrin Ward	\$	100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Michael Moghaddam	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Linda Wilford and Randall Ham	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Aleksandra Ponomareva	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	David De Valeria	\$	100.00		<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
	David De Valeria	1 3	100.00	₽	-	pisciosure requesteu, response penaing
5/4/2020	Carolyn White	\$	100.00	ď	_	Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by Give2SF	An	nount Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
5/4/2020	Sarah Kaplan	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Reynaldo L. Pantaleon	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Steffen Frech	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Lizzette Otlang	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Sarah Chuck	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Ramila Desai	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Timothy Yip	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Kevin Metcalf	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	First Republic Bank	\$	_	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	·					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/4/2020	Jewish Family and Children's Services/ Andy Coblentz and	\$	-	\$	2,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	Shari Libicki Donor Advised Continuity Fund					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
5/1/2020	Barbara Bernstein and John Tibbetts	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Alex Moskowitz	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Golden Gate Marriage and Trauma Therapy Center	\$	300.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Allie Siu and Andrew O'Connor	\$	300.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Frank and Carol Buonagurio	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	_	\$	100.00	\$		
5/1/2020	Ankit Vaish			<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Mathew Honan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Elysia B Su	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Frederico Rocha	\$	70.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	JCF's Covid-19 Fund	\$	-	\$	20,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/30/2020	Kristen Kalez	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Dennis Wei	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Jody Reiss	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Emily A Headden	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Janet Clyde	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Thousandeyes	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Ann and Jesse Agbayani	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Sarah Kiani	\$	25.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/30/2020	Anonymous Through The Benevity Community Impact Fund -	\$		\$	18,170.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,, - 0, - 0 - 0	Matching Gift Program (67 Donations)	1		7	,	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/29/2020	Tracy Chapman	\$	50,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Tania Lee and Brianna Lee	\$	10,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	The Bushichols Fund	\$	5,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Goldberger-Barnett Donor Advised Fund	\$	4,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Olagappan Manickam	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Helen Zhang	\$	750.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	3		600.00	-		
4/29/2020	Stanley Mandell	\$		_		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Gianluca Franzese		500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Debra E. Marchi	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Natalee McIntyre	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Joaquin N Torres	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Jonathan Ferrugia	\$	250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Wee-Yong Ong	\$	250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	James Thomas Conte	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Isaac Brodsky	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Eliot Kent-Uritam	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Iris S Johnson-Edlund/Robin E McNally	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Wendy Rothenberg	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Alyssa Saquilayan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Gaye Beceren	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Steve Pepple	\$	50.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	David Heflin	\$	25.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Joyce A Calagos	\$	10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
,	Slack	\$	-	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
4/29/2020	J. G. C.	4		4	100,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/29/2020				1		microst disclosure requests with SF FOUHLation
	Gong in	¢	1,000,00	ď		Disclosure requested response pending
4/28/2020	Gong.io	\$	1,000.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/28/2020 4/28/2020	Lauren Poole and Charles Masten	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/28/2020	ă .	_		\$	- - -	

		Donation Amount					
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City	
			Give2SF		SF Foundation		
4/28/2020	Andrea Aranda	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Francoise Herrmann	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Julie Kalter	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Pete Warden	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Jane Lang	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Carole E Deitrich	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Brian Streiffer and Stefanie Eldred	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Julie E Taylor	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	David Kaskowitz and Susan Kahn	\$	400.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Ann and Kwan Chen	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Cotton The First Shirtmaker	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	The Fernberg Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Owenmark Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Phil	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Andrea Nickerson	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Matthew C Miller	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Sarquis Mejia Family	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Pilates In Common Cooperative, Inc.	\$	187.95	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Mia Risher	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Bruce Bowden Johnson	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Haruko Hata	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Magdalena R Blackmer	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Jean I. Korn	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Kara Maria Art Studio	\$	125.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	The Hollrah Family	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Kylee Lessard	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Nila Bogue Staudt	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Jolie Gines	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Liana Y Szeto	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Robert Lim and Elaine Khoong	\$	100.00	·		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Geoffrey Bauman	\$	100.00	·		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Siu Ling Chen	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Chris Emanuel	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Esther Landau and Caroline Pincus	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Rachel I Mozesson	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Jeffrey Nigh	\$	100.00	ı.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Mary A Garcia Tejeda	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Adra Upadhyaya	\$	50.00	٠.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Peter Leaf	\$	50.00	ı.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Evelyn Kelsey	\$	50.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Joanne Wong	\$	50.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Florabel Flavio	\$	50.00	+ :		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Laney Whitcanack	\$	30.00	ı.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Meredith N Derecho	\$	30.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Sarah Ta	\$	30.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Sara Zak	\$	27.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020		\$		÷		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Bernadette C. Tyler Mario Lanao	\$	25.00 20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Emily Fong	\$	20.00	+	<u>-</u>	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/27/2020	Janis Greenspan	\$	19.94	+	- -	Disclosure requested, response pending	
		\$	19.94	\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	
4/27/2020	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Þ	-	Þ	15,000.00	_	
4/24/2020	Talland Mana	<i>t</i>	F 000 00	÷		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	
4/24/2020	Tailors' Keep	\$	5,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Ivy Ngo	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	The Schmidt Family	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Jeanine Nicholson	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Rebecca Gaynor	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Bruce H Agid	\$	250.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Ed Pascucci	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Ko Ko Zin and Laura Lynn	\$	100.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Bettie Holaday	\$	100.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	The Jacobson Family	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/24/2020	Nancy Y Lui	\$	99.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	

			Donation	n A	mount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
4/24/2020		¢	Give2SF	4	SF Foundation	
4/24/2020 4/24/2020	Robert Reinhard Pamela Rockwell	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/24/2020	William R. Conrad	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/24/2020	Impact Assets	\$		\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
1/2 1/2020	Impact / issets	Ψ		Ψ	10,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/23/2020	Hamid and Christina Moghadam	\$	150,000.00	\$		No financial interest with the City
4/23/2020	Anonymous Through Jewish Communal Fund	\$	5,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Excel Plumbing Supply	\$	5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Wil Curiel	\$	1,681.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Jonathan Lai	\$	600.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Bo Meng	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Simmonds & Narita LLP	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Sandra Laferrera	\$	300.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Kathleen Sasso	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Tom and Alice Pulliam	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Judith M. Coulter	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Gina M Castro	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Hillary A Ronen	\$	250.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Dhruv Maheshwari	\$	250.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Lovgreen's	\$	250.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	The Garward Family	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Annie Palmer and Will Georgantas	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Lauren M Harriman	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Akiyo Kinst-Hori	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Heorhi Fedchanka	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Ganesh Seshan	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Maeve Metzger	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Neil David Byres	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Dilara T. Mehmed	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020 4/23/2020	Valerie Aubel Sara Spengler	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Lisa Ligon	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Cynthia Guynn	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Shabnam Dadkhah	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Howard and Missy Isaacson	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Jared Brown	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Serra C Akgun	\$	60.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Peter Woods	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Lionel E Trufant	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Karlyn Tjaden	\$	50.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Dr. Carolyn Scott	\$	50.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Susan Livingood	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Meiko S Simada	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Robert Morrison	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	The Sprague's	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Randy M Girer	\$	40.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Clay and Dagmar Crichton	\$	30.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Elizabeth Totten	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Aditya Chakraborty	\$	25.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Christine Chudd	\$	25.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Suk P Kwan	\$	20.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	James Jude Jr	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020	Hoang Cuong	\$	10.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/23/2020 4/23/2020	Samuel K Wilson Bank of America	\$	10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-1 /23/2020	Dalik Of Afficiled	Þ	-)	200,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/23/2020	Comcast	\$		\$	25,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7 23/2020	Connection	Ψ	-	٩	25,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/22/2020	Shivshakti Foundation	\$	1,000.00	¢		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Sheryl Evans Davis	\$	500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Daniel Adams	\$	500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Naomi Kelly	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Josh Mukhopadhyay	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
. ,				1 7		1 ,

		Amount				
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by	_	Through	Financial Interest With the City
			Give2SF		SF Foundation	
4/22/2020	Lanedin Robbins	\$	440.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Infinity Services LLC	\$	200.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Josh Taylor	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Manaswini Garimella	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	John Robin Orme	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Aaron G Calhoun	\$	120.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Bruce Seidel	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Chloe Hill	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Julie L Campioni	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Kevin Frank and Abby Ramsden	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/22/2020	Chloe Hill	\$	50.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Cathy Hong	\$	300.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Guozi Dai	\$	200.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	David W Dumais	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Rupesh D Chavan	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Taylor Tromburg	\$	50.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Kristin Leung	\$	50.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Madeline Bredouw	\$	20.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/21/2020	Sean Elsbernd	\$	_	9	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/20/2020	Moldaw Family	\$	50,000.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Claire Solot and Sinjin Bain, Bigglesworth Family Foundation	\$	10,000.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ľ	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		•	
4/20/2020	Jennifer Braun	\$	5,000.00	9	-	No financial interest with the City
4/20/2020	Charlie Osborne	\$	2,500.00	+ -	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Billy and Michelle McRae	\$	1,000.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Scott Levokove	\$	1,000.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	True Sake	\$	1,000.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Laura D Straus	\$	900.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Borenstein - Strauss Family Fund	\$	500.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Nartker Family	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Paul and DeAnn Work	\$	500.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Xiomara Holsworth	\$	300.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Cotton The First Shirtmaker	\$	300.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Joseph M. McCune III/Karen Kaye Smith-McCune	\$	250.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Kelle Pedro	\$	250.00	+ -		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Fred Holub and Geoff McNally	\$	250.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Volley	\$	250.00	Η.		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	John Robert Bernhelm	\$	200.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Madhavi Maheshwari	\$	200.00	+ i		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Roxanne Brittain	\$	200.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Isha and Rishabh Jain	\$	150.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Christine Tran	\$	150.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Mason Scott	\$	150.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Nathaniel Fruchter	\$	125.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Raymond Chan	\$	100.00	+ -	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	John Robinson	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Kiranmayee Suryadevara	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Matthew Waters	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Laura E Sanman	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Arjan Schutte	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Candice Wold	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Caroline A Cooper	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Volley	\$	100.00	+ -		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Michael A Barnett	\$	100.00	+	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Andrea Cathcart	\$	100.00	+	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Priscilla Tov	\$	100.00	+	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	D'Anne Duncan	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Katherine Lam	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$		٠.		
4/20/2020 4/20/2020	Katherine Wang	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Lei Xiang Vikram Mohan	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/20/2020	Osorno Family	\$		+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
7/20/2020	Озотно ганніу	Þ	34.00	1 1	· -	Disclosure requested, response pending

		Donation Amount						
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City		
			Give2SF		SF Foundation			
4/20/2020	Alex Kuo	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/20/2020	Richard A Johnson	\$	20.00	ı.	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/20/2020	Jeremy Gonzales	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/20/2020	Michael Gleeson	\$	5.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/20/2020	Anonymous Through The Benevity Community Impact Fund -	\$	-	\$	8,500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
	Matching Gift Program (15 Donations)					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
4/17/2020	Mapbox	\$	4,400.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	John J Beam	\$	2,400.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	ZS Associates, Inc.	\$	2,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Malena Spar	\$	600.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Hanging Huang	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Adanya Lustig	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Catherine Geewax	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Piper Lewis	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Jaren Bonillo	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Soneri Chaturvedi	\$	70.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
		\$		<u> </u>				
4/17/2020	Erin Bailey Craig McFaddon		52.00	÷	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Craig McFadden	\$	50.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Roman Martinez	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/17/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Hercules Capital	\$	50,000.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	John & Marcia Goldman Foundation	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Cota Capital	\$	2,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Mikhal and Ron Bouganim	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Neeta Sahadev	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Raghavendra Sundresh	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Isabelle Boin	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Swanson Family	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Mapel-Lee Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	James Lovette-Black	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Hanging Huang	\$	200.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Megan Willson	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Darren Olson	\$	150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending		
		\$	125.00	\$				
4/16/2020	Asma Stephan			<u> </u>	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Onur Burak Yildirim	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	James Wilsterman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Sean Sorrell	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Jeremy Gordon Frisch	\$	100.00	ı.	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Gabriel A Mantegna	\$	100.00	ı.	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	David A Petzold	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Emily Bussiere	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Courtny L Dolan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Steele and Marsha Davidoff	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Bethany L Taylor	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	Ricky A Yee	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/16/2020	David L. Klein, Jr. Fund	\$	-	\$	3,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
,,,		,			0,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
4/16/2020	Friedman/Meyer Fund	\$		\$	5,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
4/10/2020	rneuman/weyer runu	Φ		ф	3,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
4/16/2020	Forms Fisher of Himsle O Associates	•		÷	1,000,00	1		
4/16/2020	Emma Fisher c/o Hirsch & Associates	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
		-		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
4/16/2020	LinkedIn For Good	\$	-	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial		
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation		
4/15/2020	Josh Hannah and Denise Yamamoto	\$	7,500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Mukesh Agrawal	\$	1,300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Rigney Turnham	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Cotton The First Shirtmaker	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Theodore J Kwong	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	The Salem Family	\$	108.00	÷	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Daniel Ng and Gemma Gaisano	\$	100.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020	Teresa Jones	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending		
4/15/2020		\$	100.00	7	<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending		
	Aaron Rabideau	+		+				
4/15/2020	Finkle Family	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending		

		Donation Amount					
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City	
			Give2SF		SF Foundation		
4/15/2020	Willy A Saldana	\$	60.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Derek Dong	\$	60.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Puja Ramani	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Lara D'Emilio	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Jason C Wong	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Andrew M Chen	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/15/2020	Brian H Lee	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Robert Deel	\$	1,130.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Reiri Sono	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Catherine Reilly	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	John Foley	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Tom Scharffenberger and Vicky Simonds	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Colin McKeehan	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Mark A White	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Matthew Cooper	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	John W. Crittenden	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Jiajun Zhu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Valerie Law	\$	50.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Tailors Keep	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/14/2020	Kyle and Tracy Voght Charitable Fund	\$	-	\$	50,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	
4/13/2020	Salesforce.Com	\$	1,500,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Gerson Bakar Foundation	\$	1,000,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Jeffrey Gordon Lawson and Erica Freeman Lawson	\$	500,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Lisa Stone Pritzker Family Foundation	\$	100,000.00	\$	-	Donor has construction permit with Department of	
	,		,			Building Inspection	
4/13/2020	John C. Clifford and Katrina M. Lake	\$	25,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Joshua A. Lippman and Lauren Lippman	\$	5,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Meridee Moore and Kevin King	\$	5,000.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	The Richard and Nancy Blum Fund	\$	2,500.00	·		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Bob and Daphne Bransten	\$	1,000.00	+	_	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Josina Reddy	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Tyler Sonnemaker	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Yingzhuo Zhao	\$	900.00	+	_	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Sarah Charlton & Andrew Braithwaite Charitable Fund	\$	500.00	÷	_	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Miranda Dietz	\$	500.00	ı.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Kristin L Anundsen (IRA) WFCS As Custodian	\$	500.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Jacqueline Lesage	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Regarding Art/San Francisco	\$	500.00	ı.	_	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Leigh Kloss	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Jeanne Zara Lim	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Larry V. Pulliam and Ivan L. Hodgson	\$	200.00	·		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Regina O'Shaughnessy	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Pilates In Common Cooperative, Inc.	\$	178.80	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Tami Bryant For Democratic County Central Committee 2020	\$	123.72	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
., .5, 2020	FPPC #1423709	Ψ	123.72	-		a isolosula requested, response perianig	
4/13/2020	Aditi Maheshwari	\$	101.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Isaac Brodsky	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Brandon R Wirakesuma	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Barbara L Jue	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Taylor Carroll	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Christopher Wittman	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Xiaxing Li	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Michelle Tallin	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Paige S Rossi	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Mio Nitta	\$	100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Natalie Olin	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Siddharth Mandava	\$	50.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
		\$		_			
4/13/2020	Lila W Tyler	\$	50.00	+ :		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Yun Zhao		50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Emiko Oye	\$	43.49	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	Sara A Spencer	\$	35.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
4/13/2020	L Sabau	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	

C'A Data	David Name	Donation	ı A		First in the control of the control
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
4/13/2020	John C Carrillo	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Marielle Price	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Anna McBee	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Sukanda Odonnell	\$ 10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Mable Woo	\$ 10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/13/2020	Wagmore Benevolent IV Fund	\$ -	\$	750.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/10/2020	Ray and Dagmar Dolby	\$ 100,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Reality San Francisco Church	\$ 50,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	GIC Real Estate, Inc.	\$ 20,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Jon Ying	\$ 15,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$ 5,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Meghan Guerin	\$ 1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Yvonne Young	\$ 800.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Lisa and Jeffrey Lin	\$ 500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Mike D Ikeda	\$ 500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Mark A Rathbun	\$ 200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Legacy Maker LLC	\$ 200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Kristie Kooken	\$ 100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Debra Guskin	\$ 50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Maryann Hulsman	\$ 50.00	\$	_	
4/10/2020	Erin W Tou	 25.00	<u> </u>	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/10/2020	Waymo, LLC	\$ -	\$	50,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/9/2020	The Green Cross	\$ 2,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Patrick Tam	\$ 300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Stephen Reichling and Paul Armer	\$ 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Alice Yen and Garrett Edel	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Elizabeth Harrington	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Archangel Pangan	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Lori Mason	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Sara R Corrigan	\$ 10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/9/2020	Anonymous	\$ -	\$	5,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/9/2020	Nion T. McEvoy, Sr.	\$ -	\$	100,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/9/2020	Eileen and Peter Michael Fund	\$ -	\$	15,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/8/2020	D. Wilsey Properties Co.	\$ 111,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Elizabeth F Smith	\$ 1,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Samantha and Steven Shows	\$ 800.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Cesar D Iraheta	\$ 500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Chia-Tsung Chou	\$ 300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Chris and Melissa Retajczyk	\$ 250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Connor Cimowsky	\$ 162.65	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Addison Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Cynthia Rancatore	\$ 100.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Adam L Spector	\$ 75.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Boramy Khloth	\$ 50.00	٠.	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/8/2020	Jane Gong	\$ 10.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Lendlease Development	\$ 5,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	The Gardner Family	\$ 2,500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Lori Yamauchi and James Fagler	\$ 250.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Jarie Bolander	\$ 250.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Patel Family	\$ 250.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020		\$ 200.00	-		
	Amelia May Teng Wong	\$	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Pierre-Eric Jacoupy	 150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Marc Haeberlin	\$ 100.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Charles and Nancy Ho	\$ 100.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Sarah P Delaney	\$ 100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Melissa Nelli	\$ 100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Dagang Wei	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending

		Donation	n A	Amount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
4/7/2020	Lashanda Greene	\$ 60.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Rebecca Brown	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Rajvi Joshi	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/7/2020	Juliana Appenrodt	\$ 15.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Uskglass Fund	\$ 150,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Anonymous Through Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$ 100,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	John Pritzker Family Fund	\$ 100,000.00	\$		No financial interest with the City
4/6/2020	The Newman-Montella Charitable Gift Fund	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Goldberger-Barnett Donor Advised Fund	\$ 1,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Teresa Goebel	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Jeff Karas and Josephine Fong	\$ 1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Chun Yang Fund	\$ 700.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable	\$ 600.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Smith Family	\$ 500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Elizabeth Kondor, Jim Cole	\$ 500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Carole E Deitrich	\$ 500.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Phoebe Signer	\$ 500.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Dennis Sell	\$ 315.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Suzanne S Choi/Mimi M.K. Choi	\$ 300.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Theodore Lamm	\$ 300.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Charles Z Mooney	\$ 300.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Tal Shprecher	\$ 300.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Carson Rickey	\$ 250.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Jonathan S Chan	\$ 250.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Michele C Jackson	\$ 250.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Sangha C Han	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Li Sun	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	David Goldbrenner	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Anand Ramesh	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Stefanie Arthur	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Julia Lee	\$ 200.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Michael Xing	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Angeline M Miranda	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Aimee Pierce	\$ 200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Aditya Kota	\$ 150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Roselee Greenholtz	\$ 150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Carly Webster	\$ 150.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Carolyn Wong	\$ 118.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Sam Stokes	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Tak M Poon	\$ 100.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Ronan Murphy	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	John G Zlatunich	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Wayne Lee	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Frederick Chatfield	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Ruth C Dimagmaliw	\$ 100.00	+	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Lisa He	\$ 100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Michelle Tallin	\$ 100.00	-	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Melissa Woo	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Steven H Fowler	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Hannah L Byers-Straus	\$ 50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Rene Venegas	\$ 25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Karen Reyna	\$ 20.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Guojian He	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Guojian He	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Brian Ayuban	\$ 20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Michael Frankenfield	\$ 3.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/6/2020	Kyle and Tracy Voght Charitable Fund	\$ -	\$	111,682.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/6/2020	The Stupski Foundation	\$ -	\$	500,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/3/2020	Chung Yan Lo	\$ 6,500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Jeffrey Hilnbrand	\$ 2,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by	Through	Financial Interest With the City
4/3/2020	Nebiyu D Tegegn	\$	Give2SF 250.00	SF Foundation	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Edith N Williams	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Larry Rosenstein	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Tonya M Grootendorst	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Juan Bosco Albanell Flores	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Inder Narula	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Manolito L. Claudel	\$	130.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Suzanne Mero	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Tomoya Ogura	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Brennan J Hom	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Jane Petersen	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Jaclyn Karpiak	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Lisa J Lightman	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Matt Wright and Kristen Espinosa	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Mara Ezekiel	\$	25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$	25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/3/2020	Aneel Bhusri	\$	23.00	\$ 995,010.0	1 1 1 3
4/3/2020	Affect Bridsii	•	-	\$ 993,010.0	
4/2/2020	Jacobs Chang Charitable Foundation	\$	F 000 00	\$ -	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/2/2020 4/2/2020	Jessie Cheng Charitable Foundation	\$	5,000.00 2,000.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Jake Saper and Dannie Herzberg			-	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Scott Mauvais	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Steve and Dianne Leonoudakis	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Karlo Berket	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Thomas Carabajal	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Chloe Agape	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Du Yun	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Colleen Boddy	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Evonne Chen	\$	150.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Norman Schlossberg	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Alice T Rogers	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Chen Family	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Marco Bianchi	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Anthony Federico	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Tiffany Wong	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	IREX Iraq Program Team	\$	100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Lillian Bui	\$	50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Tiffany Lee	\$	30.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Kara Gillis	\$	25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Jordan Jewell	\$	25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/2/2020	Pincus Family Fund	\$	-	\$ 100,000.0	O Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/2/2020	Kan Family Fund	\$	-	\$ 50,000.0	O Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
4/1/2020	Grammarly, Inc.	\$	75,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Berkshire Partners	\$	58,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Irene Zhou	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Evan Fried	\$	1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Bruce Agid	\$	500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Elliot Kendall	\$	250.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Lillian Tsay	\$	250.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Amy Hall	\$	200.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Tianxuan Chen	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	The Andersons	\$	200.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Joshua Taylor	\$	200.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Chih Yi Hsieh	\$	200.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Gregory Klasuner	\$	200.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Cecilie Wrye	\$	120.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Camelin Blackstone	\$	100.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Laurel Bailey	\$	100.00		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	-	\$			Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
4/1/2020	Alison S Lycette	-	100.00		
4/1/2020		1 #			
4/1/2020 4/1/2020	Angela Huang Anthony Daniell	\$	25.00 10.00		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	n Ame	ount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
			Give2SF		F Foundation	
3/31/2020	Robert Li	\$	1,000.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Buried Signal LLC	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	The Burkhart-Fitzgerald Family	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Kristiina Kansen	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Laurie Bouck	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Elizabeth I Powers	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Elizabeth N Rosseter	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Lay Tshu Tan	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Ava C Yap	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Shane Dewael	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Anna Mei-Hsiu, Chien	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Qin M Liang	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Neal P Mhaskar	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Sophie Hwang	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Diane Turner	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Alexander White	\$	75.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Sarah Cirone	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Michelle Ann Taylor	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Zoe Camille McBride	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Roger O Hernandez	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Rahul Patel	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/31/2020	Pablo Vargas	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	The Systrom Charitable Trust	\$	50,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Okelola	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Timothee Geoghegan	\$	3,580.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Charlie Stigler	\$	3,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Ben Zotto	\$	2,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Dave Piazza and Dakota Chase	\$	2,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Caven Family	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Zhize Wang	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	William Koury	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Jessica Finkel	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Rani Manoharan	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Jay Anderson	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Damon Uyeda	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Alexander Family Fund	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Kalyani Girvanesh	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Susan Baker-Lehne	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Rik Williams	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Susan Karp and Paul Haahr	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Amy D Lu	\$	350.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Michael Chen	\$	347.28	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Ellen Wang	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Anthony D. Truong	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Shubham Naik	\$	284.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Richard Avendano	\$	250.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Laura Tessin and Matthias Plappert	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Stacey Harte	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Blake, Rachael, and Rose Davidoff	\$	250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Siyao Zhu	\$	200.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Vardhman Jain	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Mike Berkowitz and Debbie Tuttle	\$	200.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Joseph M. Imbriani	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Amy T Herbertson	\$	200.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Ayushi Samaddar	\$	200.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	Consuelo Spalding	\$	200.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
12/20/2020	Shanna Wagnor	\$	200.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
					-	DELEGIES DELL'AND DE
3/30/2020	3	·		-	_	
	Nancy McCormick Bo Meng	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Decided Decided Name Process				Donation	n Δ	mount	
	Gift Date	Donor Name					Financial Interest With the City
SASS/2002 Immy-Rey S. 14-20.0				Give2SF			
			<u> </u>		+-		
The Hanse Of Gatto Renoale Trust - II Bergorey Tusters S. 100.00 S. Duchturus respected, response pending S. 100.00 S. Duchturus respected response pending					+ -		
					÷		
SADIACON Section Sec		The House Of Gatto Revocable Trust - JJ Bergovoy Trustee		100.00	Τ.		Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/30/2020	Kathleen Damore	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/30/2020	Jennifer D Ng	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
1907/2012 Oristopter's Sisos \$ 100.00 \$ Discloure requested, response predict \$130,000 \$ Discloure reques	3/30/2020	Laura Humbrecht	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
19.00/201	3/30/2020	Victor Ronin	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/30/2020	Christopher S Rossi	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
\$300/2020 Coretta Jenes \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$100/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$100/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$200/2020 Cincy Musco \$ 100.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pend	3/30/2020	Jenna Theisen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
Sado/22020 Dark Whelan S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. 100.00 S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Pita Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Pita Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Pita Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Pita Chalton S. Sado S. Dackbours requested, response pending Sado/22020 Shell Pita Chalton Sado/22020	3/30/2020	Michelle Fishberg and Vu Nguyen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
\$3,00,000 Gindy Musio	3/30/2020	Loretta Jones	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
\$30/2020 Shell Chabnon \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Maret T. Oyama \$ 5 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Amet T. Oyama \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Amet T. Oyama \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Amet T. Oyama \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Robert C. Cora \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Robert C. Cora \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Robert C. Cora \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Sanih S. Kaplan \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Sanih S. Kaplan \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel \$ 5 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3430/2020 Rosmy Daniel B. Da	3/30/2020	Ian Whelan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
\$3,00,000 Shell Chabnom \$ 100,000 \$	3/30/2020	Cindy Muzio	\$	100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
\$390/2020 Matthew S Detz \$ 100.00 \$	3/30/2020		\$	100.00	\$	_	
\$40,000 The Baizers			\$		÷	-	
\$300,2020 Lanet T. Oyama					Η.		
\$40,020.00 Robert C Long					÷		
\$ 5,000 S			<u> </u>		+-		
\$30,07,000 Sarah S Kaplan \$ \$0,00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,700,000 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,07,000 \$ Disclosure requested, res			<u> </u>		-		
					+ -		
\$ 50,00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$ 30,00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$ 30,00202 Michael Mills \$ 50,00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$ 30,00202 Ashwarya Borkar \$ 50,00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$ 30,0002 Disclos		'			Η.		1 1 1 3
\$30,02020 Nichael Mills \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nichael Mills \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nichael Mills \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nichael Mills \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile Nobel L'Esoile \$ 5,000 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending \$30,02020 Nobel L'Esoile					+ -		
3/30/2020 Michael Mills					+-		
3/30/2020			<u> </u>		÷		
3/30/2020 Nunal Sharma \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$					+-		
3/30/2020 Noelle L'Etoile \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Lui Yu Huang \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Alan Luo \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Ian Luo \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Monica Q Culanay \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Donathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Disc		Aishwarya Borkar		50.00	+ -		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	3/30/2020	Kunal Sharma		50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020	3/30/2020	Noelle L'Etoile	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Ian Luo \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Arithomy Daniel Jiang \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Jiang Pending \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Jiang \$ 10.0	3/30/2020	Cui Yu Huang	\$	50.00	\$	-	
3/30/2020 Minchael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Rohan Natraj \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Ionathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020	3/30/2020	Hannah Katherine Long	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Michael Murray \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Rohan Natraj \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response p	3/30/2020	lan Luo	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Rohan Natraj \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Katie Thomas \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel Liang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with \$F Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure	3/30/2020	Monica Q Culanay	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Phillip Kobernick \$ 36.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Ratie Thomas \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Ratie Thomas \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Ginta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure	3/30/2020	Michael Murray	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Jonathan S Abramson \$ 30.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 665 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested	3/30/2020	Rohan Natraj	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Richard J Lawne \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Katie Thomas \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with \$F Foundation S/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with \$F Foundation S/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with \$F Foundation S/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.80 \$ Drake Piper \$ 5.80	3/30/2020	Phillip Kobernick	\$	36.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Katie Thomas \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gauraw Murade \$ 20.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ Disclosure requests with SF Foundation SF Poundation	3/30/2020	Jonathan S Abramson	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaura Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30	3/30/2020	Richard J Lawne	\$	25.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Hung Dinh \$ 25.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with \$F Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with \$F Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with \$F Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with \$F Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$	3/30/2020	Katie Thomas	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/30/2020 Cinta Lewis \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2			\$		_	_	
3/30/2020 Gaurav Murade \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Abigail Owens \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation					+		
3/30/2020 Daniel L Jiang \$ 20.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			<u> </u>		_		
3/30/2020 Anthony Daniell \$ 10.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Abigail Owens \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests w		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>		+-		
3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 6.65 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Abigail Owens \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with					_		
3/30/2020 Drake Piper \$ 5.86 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/30/2020 Abigail Owens \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020					+		
3/30/2020 Abigail Owens \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation					+-		
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial				5.00	÷		1 1 3
3/30/2020 Ansley Peduru \$ - \$ 50.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	3/30/2020	Abigaii Owens	Þ	-)	25.00	
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	2 (20 (2020	A 1 D 1	+			50.00	
3/30/2020 Belinda Yamate \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation	3/30/2020	Ansiey Peduru	\$	-	\$	50.00	_
Signature Sign							
3/30/2020 Brian Calvert \$ - \$ 1,350.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor	3/30/2020	Belinda Yamate	\$	-	\$	25.00	_
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial							,
3/30/2020 Bridget Collins \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	3/30/2020	Brian Calvert	\$	-	\$	1,350.00	3
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial							interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020 Carden Bagwell \$ - \$ 300.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	3/30/2020	Bridget Collins	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial							interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	3/30/2020	Carden Bagwell	\$	-	\$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020 Charles Harrington \$ - \$ 25.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial							interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation 3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial	3/30/2020	Charles Harrington	\$	-	\$	25.00	,
3/30/2020 Chris Van Dusen \$ - \$ 100.00 Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial							_
	3/30/2020	Chris Van Dusen	\$	-	\$	100.00	
Inherest discussive reducts with 5r connication			'		'		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

			Donation An	nount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly Give25	by	Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/30/2020	Daniel Ammann	\$	- \$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	Burnet Artifficial	Ψ	Ψ	0,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Daniel Edwards	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
5/50/2020	Burner Edwards	Ψ	,	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Daniel Kuljis	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	Duriler Raijis	Ψ	Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Daniel Tien	\$	- \$	51.00	
3/30/2020	Daniel Hen	Φ	- p	31.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Eben Freeman	\$	- \$	100.00	
3/30/2020	Lbert Freeman	Φ	- p	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Edmond Jordan	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	Editiona Jordan	Φ	- p	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Eltan Labortarnos	\$	- \$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	Elton Loberternos	\$	- 5	23.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2/20/2020	Emily Lakritz	\$	- \$	75.00	,
3/30/2020	Emily Lakritz	\$	- 3	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2 /20 /2020	Farmer and Truden	.	¢	200.00	,
3/30/2020	Emmanuel Turlay	\$	- \$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
2 /2 2 /2 2 2	5. 5.			150.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Erica Banh	\$	- \$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Franck Lefebvre	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Ishan Singh	\$	- \$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Jennifer Blight	\$	- \$	350.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Jennifer Huang	\$	- \$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Jessica Yao	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Jonathon Ryan Gillespie	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Kaitlyn Williams	\$	- \$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Kristy Anne Boyd	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Luke Pulaski	\$	- \$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Manjukumar Harthikote Matha	\$	- \$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Marko Kudjerski	\$	- \$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Matthew Anderson	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		·	,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Max Meyers	\$	- \$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,	9	7	•	33.30	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Nandini Arora	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3,30,2020	Transmit Arona	Ψ	,	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Nicholas Decker	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	TVICTIOIAS DECREI	Ψ	Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Nicholas Robinson	\$	- \$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/30/2020	Nicrolas Robinson	Ψ	- 5	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2/20/2020	Nolon Finn	¢	¢	Γ0.00	,
3/30/2020	Nolan Finn	\$	- \$	50.00	_
2/20/2020	Olivia Teai	d d		20.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Olivia Tsai	\$	- \$	20.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
2 /20 /2022	Page Jalan	*		2225	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Raya Islan	\$	- \$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Rebekah Brandt	\$	- \$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Santiago Vargas Soto	\$	- \$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
					interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

Cife D	DName		Donation	ı Am		St. 11. August of St.
Gift Date	Donor Name		rectly by Give2SF	,	Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
/30/2020	The Conway Family Charitable Fund	\$	-	\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
00,2020	The command running chantable runa			4	30,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
/30/2020	Sierra Gegenheimer	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,		*		7		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
30/2020	Thomas Melanson	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
30,2020	Thomas Weldnson	Ψ		Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
/30/2020	Yunfei Wang	\$	_	\$	100.00	1
/30/2020	runier wang		-	Þ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
(20./2020	Audult Falt.	t.		+	100.00	
/29/2020	Anjuli Felix	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		_				interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
/29/2020	Brooks Reed	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Christopher Phan	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Michael Rusignola	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Namrata Rao	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Nariman Moezzi Madani	\$	-	\$	30.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
.,						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Neal Uppal	\$		\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
23/2020	теа орра	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Nicholas Christian	\$		\$	15.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
29/2020	INICIOIAS CITISUATI	₽	-	Þ	15.00	_
20 (2022	5 1 5:1			+	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Sneha Sinha	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Unnikrishnan Nair	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
29/2020	Victor Oliveira	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
28/2020	Benjamin Goldstein	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
28/2020	Charles Matlack	\$	-	\$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		'		·		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
28/2020	Matthew Fornero	\$	_	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
20,2020	Water CW Torriero	Ψ		Ψ	250.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
28/2020	Sean Harris	\$		\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
20/2020	Sean Harris	₽	-	Þ	230.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
20 (2020	C 11 :			.	250.00	
28/2020	Sean Harris	\$	-	\$	250.00	
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
28/2020	Sheila Egan	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
27/2020	Peter Kinmond	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Dan Evans	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Gateway Roofing and Waterproofing, Inc.	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	GRC Roofing, Inc.	\$	500.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Holly Haraguchi	\$	500.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Suzanna Khatchatrian	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
						1 1 1 1
27/2020	Anna Merritt and Dean Weesner	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	David and Laura Hecht	\$	500.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Alexis Leifheit	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	James King	\$	250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Lawrence S Lansing	\$	200.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Jeremy Apthorp	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Scott M Sandler	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Cyndi Wheeler	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Tyler and Teresa Herb	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Guohua Zheng	\$	200.00	<u> </u>	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Fatema Waliji	\$	200.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Zachary Olson	\$	150.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
27/2020	Matthew L Schumpert	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
61/6UCU	Marinew L Schumpert			_		
/27/2020	Alisa Diane Calvillo	\$	100.00	÷	_	Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Firectly by Give2SF		nount Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/27/2020	James Laureys	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Rick HN Curvers	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Mallory P Brown	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Tina and Oliver Burgelman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Melanie Pratt	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Kirill Zhukov	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Scotty Huhn	\$	100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Jesse Bounds	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Jennifer Murse	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Daniel Malmkvist	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Guohua Zheng	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	William Summer	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Veronica Abreu	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Ashley Harvey	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Yanna Tong	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Dimple Kapadia	\$	40.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Mitchell Averett Harris	\$		\$		1 1 1 1
			25.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Leon Zhang	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/27/2020	Andrea Santwier	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Devin Cass	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Elizabeth Sellier	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Eugene Wong	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Jessica Yao	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Violet World Foundation	\$	_	\$	5,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Shitao Zheng	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-,,	g	,		*		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/26/2020	Franklyn O Bakala	\$	10,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Jason Maynard	\$	5,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Jorge A Lopez	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Sarah Israel	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Lauren Slack	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Shannon Wells	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$		\$		
3/26/2020	Dan Davies	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	500.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Kari Nordvik	\$	500.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Bryan Lee	\$	300.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Yvonne Yau	\$	250.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Yannru Cheng	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Louis R Acresti	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Linda Pham	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Natalia Mendez Cortes	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Maryellen McGillan	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Kaicheng Chang	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Diana Hsu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Diane L Huang	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Alison Stosich	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Charles Olson	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Hilary Hsu	\$	100.00	 	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Irene Yee Riley	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Jamila Keba	\$	75.00	<u> </u>	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Hannah B Gordon	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Karen Goldenberg	\$	50.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020		\$		<u> </u>		
	Dana Riess	т	50.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/26/2020	Rengasudharsan Srinivasan	\$	25.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
1061555	I Franklin Vam China		1	ı Œ	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Franklin Yam Ching	\$	15.00	-		
3/26/2020 3/26/2020 3/26/2020	Charla Kaul Brendan O'Hare	\$ \$ \$	10.00	\$	500.00	Disclosure requested, response pending Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial

				Donation	n A	mount	
Controller Condition	Gift Date	Donor Name			IA		Financial Interest With the City
	One Date	John Hame					Thanear merest with the erry
Interest disclosure requests with \$F coundation \$	3/26/2020	Crankstart Foundation	\$		\$		Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
1,00,000	3/20/2020	Clanistate Foundation	1		Ψ	300,000.00	9
Internal coloration	3/26/2020	Griffin Childers	\$	_	\$	100.00	
	3,20,2020	Gillin Ciliders	1		Ψ	100.00	3
Interest disclosure requests with 5 Foundation Interest disclosure requests with 5	3/26/2020	Hellman Foundation	\$		\$	1,000,000,00	'
Section Sect	3,20,2020	Tiellinari oundation	Ψ		Ψ	1,000,000.00	_
Interest disclosure requests with 5F Foundation Interest disclosure requests with 5F Foundat	3/26/2020	Hon Kwok	¢		¢	100.00	·
	3/20/2020	TIOTI KWOK	J.		Ψ	100.00	3
Series Sun	2/26/2020	Justin DoCall	¢		¢	50.00	
Section Sect	3/20/2020	Justin Deceil	Φ	_	Ф	30.00	_
Delication Del	2/26/2020	Veren Cun	4		đ	25.00	
September Sept	3/20/2020	Rateri Suri	Φ	-	Þ	25.00	_
Section	2/26/2020	Olivia Issae	4			100.00	
Saction	3/26/2020	Olivia Isaac	\$	-	\$	100.00	_
Tom Rath	2 /2 5 /2 2 2 2		+		_	10.000.00	
Section Sect	3/26/2020	Shashwat Kandadai	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	_
Viritha Suresh Viri							·
Section Sect	3/26/2020	Tom Raith	\$	-	\$	20.00	_
Marker Gray							·
	3/26/2020	Vinitha Suresh	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
							·
325/2020 Colin Demman	3/26/2020	Walter Gray	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	_
							interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
	3/25/2020	Colin Denman	\$	3,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/25/2020	Margaret and Henry Brodkin	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2002 Erra M Rufino	3/25/2020	Kirsti Aho	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2002 Siram Krishnan \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	3/25/2020	Rachit Nandwani and Priyanka Singh	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	3/25/2020	Ezra M Rufino	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/25/2020	Sriram Krishnan	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	3/25/2020	Sanjay Mani	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020 Josephine Simon \$ 250.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Peter Straus and Lilli Byers \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 George and Melluh Lee \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 David Kennedy \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 David Kennedy \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Carolyn Torn and E Matta Ir \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wal Chung Wong \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Junan and Shanna Pang \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Surabh Sahni \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Surabh Srivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Rina Orbean \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ardrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ardrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ardrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ardrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ardrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Armsew Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested,	3/25/2020	Andrew Chan and Yena Kim	\$	300.00	\$	-	
3/25/2020 Peter Straus and Lili Byers \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 George and Melluh Lee \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ceorge and Melluh Lee \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Carolyn Torn and E Matta Jr \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Chung Wong \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Chung Wong \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saurabh Sahni \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saurabh Sahni \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Shrivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Shrivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Shrivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wair Shrivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wichael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wichael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Wichael McKeon \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Winn Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$		Josephine Simon	\$	250.00	\$	-	, , , , ,
		•			_	-	
3/25/2020		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>		
3/25/2020		-	\$		<u> </u>		
3/25/2020		*			÷		
3/25/2020 Junan and Shanna Pang \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saurabh Sahni \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Vaish Srivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brian Ohearn \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Andrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Michael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Michael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 James W Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack M					+ -		, , , , ,
3/25/2020 Saurabh Sahni \$ 200.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Vaish Srivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brian Ohearn \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Andrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Michael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 James W Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Kaitlyn Fowler \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer <					÷		
3/25/2020 Vaish Srivathsan \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brian Ohearn \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Andrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Michael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 James W Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Kaitlyn Fowler \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Valliam L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Varshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni		3	- '		-	_	
3/25/2020 Brian Ohearn \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Andrew Branscomb \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Michael McKeon \$ 150.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 James W Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Kaitlyn Fowler \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Batrick J Maley \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Varmshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen <td></td> <td></td> <td>- '</td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>			- '		_		
3/25/2020Andrew Branscomb\$ 150.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Michael McKeon\$ 150.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020James W Pace\$ 120.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Simon Tan\$ 120.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Kaitlyn Fowler\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Zack Morris\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020William L Rohrer\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020William L Rohrer\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Saining Li\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Vamshi Krishna Repala\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Sarah J Aerni\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response p					_		
3/25/2020Michael McKeon\$150.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020James W Pace\$120.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Simon Tan\$120.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Kaitlyn Fowler\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Zack Morris\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020William L Rohrer\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Patrick J Maley\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Saining Li\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Vamshi Krishna Repala\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Sarah J Aerni\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$100.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020					+		
3/25/2020 James W Pace \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Kaitfyn Fowler \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Patrick J Maley \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Vamshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Varshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Varshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking<					+		
3/25/2020 Simon Tan \$ 120.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Kaitlyn Fowler \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Varnshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Slack For Good \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Rolling Sailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Rolling Shalin Shashi Kumar Shankar \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng					+-		
Size					+		1 1 1 3
3/25/2020 Zack Morris \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Patrick J Maley \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Vamshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Slack For Good \$ 75.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Hailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					+		1 1 1 3
3/25/2020 William L Rohrer \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Patrick J Maley \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Saining Li \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Vamshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Slack For Good \$ 75.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Hailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brad Girardeau \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.0					÷		
3/25/2020Patrick J Maley\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Saining Li\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Vamshi Krishna Repala\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Sarah J Aerni\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Holly J Allen\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Slack For Good\$ 75.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					·		
Saining Li Sai					+ -		
3/25/2020 Vamshi Krishna Repala \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Slack For Good \$ 75.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Hailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brad Girardeau \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 5/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, re		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			+		
3/25/2020 Sarah J Aerni \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Holly J Allen \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard W Bailey III \$ 100.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Slack For Good \$ 75.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Fan Tielking \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Hailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brad Girardeau \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Bradley Zundel \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Bradley Zundel \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response		3			+		
3/25/2020Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Holly J Allen\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Slack For Good\$ 75.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending		·			+		
3/25/2020Holly J Allen\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$ 100.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Slack For Good\$ 75.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/25/2020Richard W Bailey III\$ 100.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Slack For Good\$ 75.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/25/2020Slack For Good\$75.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$50.00\$-Disclosure requested, response pending		<u> </u>			÷		
3/25/2020Fan Tielking\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Hailey C Teton\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Brad Girardeau\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending					+ -		
3/25/2020 Hailey C Teton \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Brad Girardeau \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Bradley Zundel \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/25/2020 Brad Girardeau \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Richard L Ledon \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Bradley Zundel \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/25/2020Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending					+		
3/25/2020Richard L Ledon\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Bradley Zundel\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending3/25/2020Pin-Ya Tseng\$ 50.00\$ -Disclosure requested, response pending					+-		
3/25/2020 Bradley Zundel \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending 3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending			- 7		+-		
3/25/2020 Pin-Ya Tseng \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending		Richard L Ledon		50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
		Bradley Zundel		50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020 Steven Kasapi \$ 50.00 \$ - Disclosure requested, response pending		Pin-Ya Tseng		50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	3/25/2020	Steven Kasapi	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by Give2SF	n An	nount Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/25/2020	Olivia Malterre	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Anna Schomer	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Paula Gerhardt	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Liz Marxen	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Albert Lee	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Rita Hao	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Elizabeth A. Carey	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Sara Dermody	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Nola Ong	\$	10.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Adriana Rosas	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Namana Nosas	1		Ψ.	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Alexandri Zavodny	\$		\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Alexandi Zavodny	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Ambor Illia	\$		\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Amber Illig	Þ	-	Þ	50.00	3
2 (25 (2020		<i>t</i>		+	75.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Andrew Acosta	\$	-	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Anup Parameswaren	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Cody Neil	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Craig Callihan	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Eileen Bai	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Erik Danko	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Erin Antcliffe	\$	_	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-,,		1		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Fen Chen	\$	_	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Ten Chen	Ψ		Ψ	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Feng Zhong	\$		\$	E0.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	reng zhong	Þ	-	Þ	30.00	_
2 (25 (2020	Waring A A la	\$		+	250.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Karine Mule	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		_				interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Kelsey Abdollahian	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Luke Pulaski	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Mahesh Seetharaman	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Marie Ledger	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Matthieu Fond	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Meet Bhagde	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Michael Pierce	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3,23,2020	The last the last	*		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Michael Plotz	\$	-	\$	360.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	INICIAEI FIOLZ	Φ		Þ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2 /25 /2020	Marka Ouara	4		4	100.00	*
3/25/2020	Moshe Ororn	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
2 (25 (200	2.10				100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Rafael Quiroz	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
		1.		ļ.,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Raluca Musaloiu-Elefteri	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Robert Grant	\$	-	\$	1,200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Sahil Narang	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Shakti Shah	\$	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial

			Donation	ı A	mount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
2/25/2020	Stanbania Day	ď	Give2SF	\$	SF Foundation	Controller's Office is according time depart financial
3/25/2020	Stephanie Box	\$	-	Þ	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Taylor Thomas	\$		\$	10.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Taylor momas	Ф		ф	10.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Thomas Boyd	\$		\$	1,000.00	
3/23/2020	momas boyu	Ф		ф	1,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2 /25 /2020	Wyatt Alt	\$		\$	200.00	
3/25/2020	wyatt Alt	\$	-	Þ	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/25/2020	7hichang Van	\$		\$	100.00	
3/25/2020	Zhichang Yan	\$	-	>	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/24/2020	Kristina Davidas and Coatt Taylor	\$	5,000.00	\$		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
	Kristine Boyden and Scott Taylor			<u> </u>	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Corey Block	\$	5,000.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Brian J Tarricone	\$	2,000.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Hala K Hijazi	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Martin Mackerel	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Jeffrey C Kuo	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Github Social Impact Team	\$	800.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Ben Villagra	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Anand Ramesh	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Berthoux Family	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Irene Lee	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Richard and Phillip Gonzalez	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Alice Liu	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Deirdre Hussey	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Susanna Goldenstein	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Andreas Pedersen	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Lauren Tulp	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Marion Holaday	\$	200.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Anna Brown	\$	125.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Carol S Michely	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Sherry J Wickwire	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Mary Rose Costello	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Yu Chen Hou	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Matt Grigoryan	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020		\$		\$		
	Asdrubal Ibarra	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Veena Bontu		100.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Crystal Dolis	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Shirley Li	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Steven Kaplan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Karlyn Tjaden	\$	75.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Brian P Marentay	\$	50.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Colleen Regan	\$	50.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Laura Spaventa	\$	50.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Pranay Suresh	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Elizabeth Ramirez	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Khariza Estacio	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Alexander Venegas	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/24/2020	Amanda Jacob	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Amy Kepler	\$	-	\$	250.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Anant Rathi	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Bruce Botsford	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
. ,		1		1		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Divya Thakur	\$	_	\$	1,000,00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
5,2 1,2020	Silya Makai	"		ب	1,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Matthew Goudeau	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
J/ L7/ LULU	waterew Goudeau	•	-	Þ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
2/24/2020	Dator Martin	\$		đ	25.00	,
3/24/2020	Peter Martin	*	-	\$	25.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
2/24/2020	Doch alla Calabranza	+		+	400.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Rachelle Celebrezze	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation

			Donation	n An	nount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/24/2020	Savannah Leggett	\$	- GIVE23I	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 2 ., 2020	Suraman Leggett	4		Ť	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Shahram Rezaei	\$	-	\$	50.00	
-, ,				·		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Sue-Ling Huynh	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Tristan Zier	\$	-	\$	250.00	
				ľ		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Tyalor Cunnington	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
-, ,	,			ľ		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Tyler Tate	\$	-	\$	100.00	
-,,	,,	•		,		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Wenbing Bai	\$	_	\$	200.00	
3,2 1,2020	Tremaing but	ļ .		,	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$	50,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Ross A Boucher Trust - Ross Aaaron Boucher Trustee	\$	50,000.00	\$		No financial interest with the City
3/23/2020	Sixth Street Partners	\$	25,000.00			No financial interest with the City
3/23/2020	Nicholas C Fox	\$	10,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Degree, Inc. dba Lattice	\$	10,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 3/23/2020	Will and Julie Parish	\$	5,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
					-	1 1 1 3
3/23/2020	Ben, Ruby and Jasper Shaw, and Suzanne Thomas	\$	2,500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Matthew G Crocker	\$	2,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Andrew Timmons	\$	2,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Gibson B. Biddle and Kristen M. Hege	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Michael Gold/Susan West	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	David A Herman	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Desiye Neil Collier	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	No financial interest with the City
/23/2020	Philip J Rose	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Julie Trescott	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Anonymous Through Fidelity Charitable	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Brandon Schwartz	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Liam Doyle	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Emma L Dill	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Adam J Desouza	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Walter A Haas	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Killian Murphy and Elizabeth Drew	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	The Frances Ho and George Yu Endowment	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Long Tang and Kian Lim	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Sarah E Scussel	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Alvin Baum and Robert Holgate	\$	500.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Kamal Benkiran	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Pacini Family	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Andrew G Scott	\$		_		Disclosure requested, response pending
			500.00	_		1 1 1 3
/23/2020	Erika Brown Ekiel	\$	500.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Andrew Larsen	\$	500.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Steve Cary and Sean McBride	\$	500.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Kevin Burke	\$	500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	James C Moschou	\$	300.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Steven and Kay Sheh	\$	300.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Mindy Ginsburg	\$	300.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Andrea Freedman	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Raymond P Hoehn, Jr	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Shannon N Bennett/Durrell D Kapan	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Barbara Benjamin	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	David Wohlreich	\$	250.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	S Leslie Goldstein	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Douglas Coker	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Eric C Schwartz	\$	250.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Elizabeth and Jinal Surti	\$	250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Jana Messerschmidt	\$	250.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/23/2020	Jennifer L Scheidt/James D Gold	\$	200.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Erin Laye	\$	200.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
(//3////////						

3/23/2020 Eri 3/23/2020 Lir 3/23/2020 Lir 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Co 3/23/2020 Sa	rin Lane tephan Zuercher inda Lin he Hartsell Family ulia Lee oo Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby Slenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson christopher Aycock	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Directly by Give2SF 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00 100.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Through SF Foundation	Pisclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ste 3/23/2020 Lir 3/23/2020 Th 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Sa	tephan Zuercher inda Lin he Hartsell Family ulia Lee o Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby silenn Thomas orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton irystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Lir 3/23/2020 Th 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Fe 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa	inda Lin he Hartsell Family ulia Lee oo Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton irystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Th 3/23/2020 Jul 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Fe 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sa	he Hartsell Family ulia Lee o Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Juli 3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Fe 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sa	ulia Lee to Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Bo 3/23/2020 Fe 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa	o Meng enny Lin Illen Kort Price Michael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Fe 3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Gld 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sa	enny Lin Illen Kort Price dichael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton Grystal Le Connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Elli 3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Glv 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sa	Illen Kort Price Aichael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Drew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Ev 3/23/2020 Gld 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa	Aichael Panoff velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Drew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ev. 3/23/2020 Glu 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Jes 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Sa	velyn Killaby Silenn Thomas Orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Glu 3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Gr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ha 3/23/2020 Ha	Silenn Thomas Drew Schuster and Krista Forgey Drew Schuster and Preeyanka Ajmani Drew Schuster and Preeyanka Aj	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Dr 3/23/2020 Jan 3/23/2020 Jes 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa	orew Schuster and Krista Forgey ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le fonnie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa	ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le fonnie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Jar 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sc 3/23/2020 Sa	ane A Sherman essica Fain ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le fonnie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$	- - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Lo 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cc 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Cc 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ha	ori Dietrich ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le fonnie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$ \$ \$	- - -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ha	ascha Benjamin Cohen umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton frystal Le fonnie Rawson ara Winslow fobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$ \$	- -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ha	umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton crystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Su 3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ha	umeet and Preeyanka Ajmani wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton crystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sw 3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ha	wathi Bonda acquelyn M Horton irystal Le connie Rawson ara Winslow tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$ \$	150.00 150.00 150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Jac 3/23/2020 Cr 3/23/2020 Cc 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ha	acquelyn M Horton Trystal Le Tonnie Rawson ara Winslow Tobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$	150.00 150.00	\$, , , , , ,
3/23/2020 Cr. 3/23/2020 Co. 3/23/2020 Sa. 3/23/2020 Sa. 3/23/2020 Sa. 3/23/2020 Sa. 3/23/2020 Sa. 3/23/2020 Ch. 3/23/2020 Ke. 3/23/2020 Ma. 3/23/2020 Ha.	irystal Le ionnie Rawson ara Winslow lobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$ \$ \$	150.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Cc 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ro 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Mi 3/23/2020 Ha	onnie Rawson ara Winslow lobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$		\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ro 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	ara Winslow lobert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	\$	100.00	\$		
3/23/2020 Ro 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	obert Combier abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson		100.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	abrine Rekik arah Locke-Henderson	S	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sa 3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	arah Locke-Henderson		100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ch 3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha		\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ke 3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	hristophor Avcock	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ma 3/23/2020 Ha	illistophel Aycock	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ha	elsey Villalobos	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Maria Pasos-Nunez and Richard Nunez	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	laoyang Zhu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 No	loah Levin	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Tro	roxel Family	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ni	lick and Shannon O'Shea	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Se	ean Sorrell	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Ry	yan Lanteigne	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 An	andrew J Seigner	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ondon Lee	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Young Lee	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	AcAuliffe Family	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	elly K Pagano	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	rik E Rotman	\$	100.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	acqueline O'Dwyer	\$	100.00	÷	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ameela Din	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
	arah Saltrick Meyer			·		1 1 1 3
	oshua A Stubbs	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Jaman Agrawal	\$	100.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	aia Brookes	\$	100.00	÷	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Christopher M Wade	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Danny S Gonzalez	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	eter L Scott	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ennifer Liu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Yir	ing He	\$	75.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Eri	rica J Steimetz	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Pa	atrick Lee	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Gr	Gregory S. Borman	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020 Sh	halin Modi	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ristin Rhodes	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ishal Singal	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	achel Baker	\$	50.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	dam Greenberg	\$	50.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	rishal Seshaqiri	\$	50.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
	auren Sassoubre	\$	50.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
	Perise Allen	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
2 /22 /2020	C · D ·		Give2SF		SF Foundation	D: 1
3/23/2020 3/23/2020	Sania Baqai	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Courtney Anne Bell	\$	50.00 50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Angela Avera Sanjana Ramana	\$	30.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$	30.00	\$		1 , 1 1 3
3/23/2020	Family Suendermann-Oeft	\$		-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Randi Slaughter-Broussal		25.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Philipp Kuecuekyan	\$	25.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Eugenia Lee	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Elzbieta Gibbons	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Selina B Wang	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	The Harper Family	\$	25.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Joan Gamell	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Tiffany Hsu	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Jordon Wing	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Matt Lewis	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Sheila D. Gunter	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$	10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Aish Raj Dahal	\$	10.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Heidi R Hamilton	\$	10.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Ilona Smuk	\$	1.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/23/2020	Albert Q. Pham	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Albert Yang	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Anvesh Kunati	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Arkadeb Ghosal	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Ashley Sams	\$	_	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Cassandra Clark	\$		\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
0, 20, 202		, T		7		interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Daniel Tien	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3, 23, 2323	James Herr	ļ *		,	30.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	David Rubin	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	David Kubiii	, and the second		Ψ	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Eric Lujan	\$		\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	Life Edjair	Φ		Ф	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	lan Swarbrick	\$		\$	300.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
3/23/2020	lan Swarbrick	\$	-	Þ	300.00	_
2 (22 (2020		4			400.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Jonathan Tang	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
2 /22 /2222	W			_	50.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Kenneth Fendick	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Kevin Keogh	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Kevin Metti	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Louis Roseguo	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Preston-Werner Foundation	\$	-	\$	250,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Ramachandran Jagadeeswaran	\$	-	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Rishab Sareen	\$	-	\$	50.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
						interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Robert Ussery	\$	-	\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
	Í	7			2.2.30	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Roman Sergeev	\$	_	\$	1,000.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
5, 25, 2020		Ψ		Ψ	1,000.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Spencer Hoffman	\$		\$	150.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
J/ LJ/ LULU	Spericer Homman	Φ	-	Ψ	150.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
				<u> </u>		interest disclosure requests with SF FOUNDATION

			Donation	n Amount		
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/23/2020	Stefanie Von Guten	\$	GIVEZ3F	\$	75.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
5/25/2020	Stelanic von Gaten	Ψ		Ψ	75.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Stephen Staffieri	\$	-	\$	200.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,, 23, 2020	Stephen Stamen			,	200.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Syed Hussain	\$	_	\$	100.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
,, 23, 2020	Syeu Hussum	4		Ť	100.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Wilbur Arajuo	\$		\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/23/2020	Wilbut Arajuo	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Yi-Yu Chen	\$		\$	500.00	Controller's Office is coordinating donor financial
7/23/2020	Ti-Tu Chen	Ψ		Ψ	300.00	interest disclosure requests with SF Foundation
/20/2020	Thomas M Gloger	\$	3,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Epic Church San Francisco	\$	2,500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Shawn Grunberger and Debbie Kahn	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	3	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Benjamin Shulman Riddhi Shah	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Gaurav Gollerkeri	\$	500.00	\$		1 1 1 1
					-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Colin Beighley	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Kyle Petrovich	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Amanda Eller	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Maliha Khan and Alan Cordova	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Patricia Perozo	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Claire Markham	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Amy Jiang	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Randall Maycock	\$	180.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Bingxin Zhang	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Kamryn Claridge	\$	110.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Sean M Kane	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Sylvia Irene Sroba	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	The Schnouies	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Neha Batra	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Sharon Coone	\$	100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Neil House III	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Diana Tsao	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Ruud Visser	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Volley Inc	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Eric Chun	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Nancy Pan	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Vaishali K Mullapudi	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Andrew Scarani	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Chloe Aftel	\$		-		
/20/2020		\$	50.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Michael Young		50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Christopher Shewchuck	\$	50.00	<u> </u>	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Emily R McNab	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Samuel and Rebecca Garfield	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Elizabeth Reid	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Jean Dere	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Liezel Cruz Family	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Catherine Jue	\$	50.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Jue Zou	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Rafaela De Oliveira	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Valerie Stevens	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Ralph Richart	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Alyssa M Lim	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Matt Zwicky	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/20/2020	Jeannine Fleck	\$	5.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/19/2020	John Stedman	\$	2,000.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
/19/2020	Michael Rolig	\$	1,000.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
/19/2020	Snuller and Erika Price	\$	1,000.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
/19/2020	Jordan Rose	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
/19/2020	Leila M Dwight	\$	500.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
	3				-	
/19/2020 /19/2020	Hayley N Gross Stewart Mandel	\$	300.00 250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
				. 4	_	ILLIECTOCLIFA FACILIACTED FACENORS PANDING

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City
			Give2SF		SF Foundation	
3/19/2020	Doug and Ellen Kahn	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Justin Durack	\$	250.00	<u> </u>	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Wey Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Sangmin Lee	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Alexandra Wong	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Guannan Shi	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Kirsten and Chris Byron	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Ben Neumann	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Nana Kofi K Ohene-Adu	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Melanie Day	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Peter L Vliet	\$	150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Joanna Ga Wah Gee	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Michael Holmes	\$	125.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Vanessa Ginman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Maria S Chang	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Cameron J Lencki	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Colleen Chung	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Grace Sakoda	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Cory Bennett	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Kristan Frankel	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Sonia Lawrence	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Carl Stein	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Menaka Fernando	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Amy Chen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Emily McLinden	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Christiana Lackner	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Zach Thigpen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Alice Zheng	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Eric Chong	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Liam Pedersen	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Sheila Vergara and Elkin Chacon	\$	100.00	+ -	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Susan J Adams	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Rodrigo Manubens	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Katherine Lohec	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Ruth Sappelt	\$	99.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Alexander Kumamoto	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Louis M Goudeaui	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Samantha Harrington	\$	50.00	<u> </u>	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Corey Vernon	\$	50.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Monique Gannon	\$	40.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Da-Yup Kim	\$	40.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	April Gaudette	\$	25.00	+ -		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Natasha Dimond	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Christina Pluta	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Cheryl Contee	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/19/2020	Annemaria Breaux	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Team Elbogen	\$	3,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Rica Santos	\$	1,000.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020 3/18/2020	John Robinson	\$	1,000.00	+	-	1 1 1 3
3/18/2020		\$	1,000.00	+	<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
	Craig and Lorraine Mautner	\$		+		
3/18/2020	The Hatfield Family	+ -	1,000.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Paul Mandel	\$	1,000.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Caption Health	\$	600.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Michael Zhang	\$	500.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Sarah Chan	\$	500.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Lisa Lin	\$	400.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Nira Pandya and Neel Iyer	\$	350.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Schulkin Family	\$	300.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Aileen Appe	\$	300.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Patty Kong and Philippe Fossier	\$	300.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Vivien Nguyen	\$	300.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
				1 4		
3/18/2020 3/18/2020	Elliot Kendall Charlotte and Tyler Will	\$	250.00 250.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	n A	Amount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/18/2020	Jonathan Eldridge	\$	250.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Ana Gardea and Zac Cox	\$	250.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Cynthia and Adi Berglez	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Atrejo Patridge	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Swaroop Jagadish	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jaclyn H Prange	\$	150.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Gary and Linda Zellerbach	\$	150.00	\$	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Philip Chu and Corinna Lee	\$	150.00	\$	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Emily Martinez	\$	125.00	9	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Ryan Ryan	\$	110.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Elizabeth Hamel	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Nicole Appleton	\$	100.00	\$	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Won Jun Bae	\$	100.00	9	5 -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Hannah Schlacter	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Tito and Sharon Piansay	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Lindsey Hogg	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Juanjuan Han	\$	100.00	9	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jennifer A Plath	\$	100.00	9	<u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Lara K Owen	\$	100.00	9	· 5 -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Yejin Kwon	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Sarah Maisel	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jonathan Meade	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Rachel Hill	\$	100.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Glennis Coursey	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Joseph and Margaret Ciarallo	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Catherine and Trey House	\$	100.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Leonore Ralston	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Luanne Sequeira	\$	100.00	9	*	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Bill Smullin	\$	100.00	9	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Molly Alarcon	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Helen Ung	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jaosn Goodman	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Patrick L Canfield	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Shantha Condamoor	\$	100.00	9		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Nikrad Mahdi	\$	100.00	4		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Ingfei Chen	\$	75.00	4		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Alexander S Majercik	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Nicole Glabinski	\$	50.00	4	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Yash Kshirsagar	\$	50.00		*	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Kathryn Garner	\$	50.00	,	T	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Liz Catalano	\$	50.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$	50.00	+		
3/18/2020	Paul Chu	\$		+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jazmine Applin	\$	50.00	Η.		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Eric Constantin	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Zachary M Subin	_	50.00	Η.		
3/18/2020	Ozge Islegen	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Helen Resor	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Rachel Hsu	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Marissa Phillips	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Pierce Street SF, LLC	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Scott Numamoto	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Jared Erondu	\$	25.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	David Nolan	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/18/2020	Nathaniel Stanley	\$	20.00	-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	The Hansma Family	\$	10,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Glynn Capital	\$	5,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Britt H Evangelist	\$	2,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Steven Chang	\$	1,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Eric Koslow	\$	1,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Andrew L Perito	\$	1,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Evan McCulloch	\$	1,000.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Charles Fisher and Chelsea Childs	\$	1,000.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Faya Peng	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name		Donation		l-	Financial Interest With the City
Girt Date	DONOT Name		Directly by Give2SF	Throu SF Found	_	Financial interest with the City
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Mumm Meier	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Victor Smith	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kumar Family	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kendra Byrne and McLean Echlin	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Aaron Pigeon and Emily Olson	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Sean Engel	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Justyna Janczyszyn	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Sean D Childers	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Samantha Jane Bennett	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Stacey Baradit	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kristin Leung	\$	270.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Theodore Kwong	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Yoo-Yoo Yeh	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Colleen McGinnis	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Michel Louis Alexander	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Marivel Nicolas	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Dennis A Antenore	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Greg and Stephanie Rewis	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Guillaume Forget and Francisco Rodrigues	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	William E Reeves	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Paul Supawanich and Catherine Covington	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Sarah Chung	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Andrew Gibiansky	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Lauran Bradley Johnson	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Pauli Lieponis and Ashley Hodges	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Craig Weibel	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Andrew Stanek	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Danielle Bogaards	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Wang and Thomas Yohannan	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Amanda Morgan	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Akash Mohanty	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Holly Friel	\$	175.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Denise E Lee	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Paul Bien and Karen Nakasato	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Pedro Ortez	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	The Enrights	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Leslie Simon	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Brooke L Peterson	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Jessica Nolan	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Anna Andresian	\$	150.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	George Koster	\$	150.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Long Ouyang	\$	101.69		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Tachtech	\$	101.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Bezhou Feng	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	The Lees	\$	100.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Aaron Lapierre	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Brynne Henn	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kimberly Johnson	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Devon, Amy and Bennett Wilson	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	James and Rosalind Johnson and Family	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Gulabi Rajasekar	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
	+	\$		\$		
3/17/2020	Kathryn M Jereza		100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Sarah Murphy	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Samara Flug	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Mehmet C Anbardiar	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Suhas Deshpande		100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Danan Barnett	\$			-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Minyoung Chun	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Katherine Meng	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	<u> </u>	_	100 01	.		B: 1
3/17/2020 3/17/2020	Bianca Buckridee	\$	100.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	<u> </u>	\$ \$ \$		\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

		Donation	Amount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by	Through	Financial Interest With the City
		Give2SF	SF Foundation	
3/17/2020	Michael R Petrick	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Terrence B Jenkins	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Aashna Mago	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Bronwen Marshall-Bass	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kendra Wong Morrison	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Leah Jackson	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Lucy Dotson	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Jennifer Anderson	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Faith H Yi	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Burl	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	David Tsai	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Dale A Martin	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Lyndsay Murrow	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Roberto Lopez and Martha Mellblom	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Rebecca Archer	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Ryan Biggs	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kristie Kooken	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Lisa Ratner	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	William Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kathryn Pulaski	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Stuebe Family	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Wendy Bear	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Sabeena Pradhan	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Mara Raider	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Zahyaan M Adnan, Asif M Adnan, Farhana Tasneem	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kaleb Tseo	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Cristiano Ceccarelli	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Meredith Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Nirav Nikunj Patel	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	The Prodehl Family	\$ 100.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Joanna Goldin	\$ 75.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Jennifer Suen	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Katherine Obrien	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Clement Canonne	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Nadine Carole	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Amar Chokshi	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Casey Jung	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Carol R Langbort	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	May Stearman	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Puthita Wacharasin	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Chester Hitz	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Phuong L Vu	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kelly Murphy	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Aamna Dhillon	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Preethi Vijaykrishnan	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Brenna Marketello	\$ 50.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Judith F Leff	\$ 36.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Clio A Korn	\$ 35.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Jordan Rozsa	\$ 25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Kathryn MacDonald	\$ 25.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Alisha Mowder	\$ 20.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Bethany S Campos	\$ 20.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Isaac Jacobs-Gomes	\$ 20.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Namrita Singh Mathew	\$ 15.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Jeannine Fleck	\$ 10.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/17/2020	Ryan Davids	\$ 5.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sahil Shah	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Frederick B Zamore	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$		
3/16/2020	Justin Wyckoff	\$ 5,000.00		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jessica Hilberman and Katrina Reid	2,500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Daniel Byrd	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kent and Lauren Goldman	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alberto Gobbi and Man-Ling Lee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	n Amo	ount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	_	Directly by Give2SF	s	Through F Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	Fiona Parker-Givens and Rob Hayes	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Wally and Gretchen Cheng	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Melanie Subbiah	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Brian Singerman	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aestek Consulting	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Moira Burke	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lucy Farey-Jones	\$	1,000.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Matthew Chanoff	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Margaret R Wrensch	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christopher Tuttle	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Brett Bukowski	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mehul Kar	\$	1,000.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	John F. Moroney	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Catherine Izard	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tony Gonzales	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vera Wasacz	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ted and Grace Benson	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rebecca and Aaron Newton	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Meena Lin	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kathleen Odowd	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jean Yang	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Andrew Schlaikjer	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kapanoglu Family	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Frank Bailinson	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gaurav and Pujita Mathur	\$	1,000.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vipul Prakash and Vanessa Hsu	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Robert Hodsdon	\$	1,000.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alexander Barth	\$	600.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Etgen-Kieber Foundation	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	The Leifer Family	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mary Thengvall	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Natnael Getahun	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sanae Rosen	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	11 11 111	\$		\$		
3/16/2020	Amy Woodrum and Andrew Zloto	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Adam Cue		500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Matthew Wagner	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Victor Torres	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	James Barnes	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Paul and Danice Fagin	\$	500.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sabeek Pradhan	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Caroline Fichtenberg	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Cecily A Dumas	\$	500.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mozhdeh Rastegar-Panah	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mary Lee and Reid Williams	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Devon Turner and Christine Trac	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shir Yehoshua	\$	500.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jesse Vaughan and Jennifer Ong Vaughan	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hao Zou	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Granahan Law, P.C.	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shannon and Chris Terschluse	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Edward Whitmore and Deborah Greenwood	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Britt Williams and John Stallard	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Brady J. Frey	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Andrew Sutherland	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Noelle Mabanta	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Erica, Ava and Livi Desouza	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jeffrey Sarnat and Rebecca Schapiro	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Cole Bennett	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gillian Yu	\$	500.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	6 61	_		d.	_	D: I I
3/16/2020	Susan Schwegman	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Brian and Laura Millham	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	n Am	ount		
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by		Through	Financial Interest With the City	
			Give2SF		SF Foundation		
3/16/2020	Sarah Rogers and Bob Hillman	\$	500.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	David L McIntosh	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Kelli A Broin	\$	500.00		-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Emily Angyal	\$	500.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Deborah Cooper	\$	450.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Katlin Smith	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Jesse Charles Battalino	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Sandeep Bhanot	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
	Aimee Lucido		300.00	_	-		
3/16/2020	Doug Gravelle and Stephanie Kim	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Deb Janowski and Umesh Kaushal	\$	300.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Gareth B Cross	\$	300.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sayuri Dimitroff	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Jacqueline Paige Stoermer	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Enrique Family	\$	250.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Michael P Rabbitt	\$	250.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Kristin Fleming	- '	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Kevin and Heather Lutz	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sharon Wang and Peter Shiau	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Matthew J Losardo	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	David Ross	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Megan Chin	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	John R Murgia Jr	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sean P Cotter	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Roz Leiser and Lee Guion	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Truc Nguyen	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	The Limmons Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Angelos Kottas and Phyra McCandless	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Jeff Wallace	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Carolyn Rundell	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ryan Hoyt	\$	250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Nikolai Varnavski and Radhika Ramanan	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	The Behnam Family	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Thomas Meyer, MD and Rebecca Husband	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Roberta Sarnoff	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Michael A Shiplett	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	James Cross	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Heidi Patel	\$	250.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Nicholas Peterson	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Yi Yin	\$	250.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Avril Swan Md	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	James Nguyen	\$	250.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Chris and Madison Etterman	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Jacqueline M Ali Cordoba	\$	250.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Alyssa Roy	\$	200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Audrey K Oneill	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Yingzhuo Zhao	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Colin Dickau	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Melody Cheung	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Angelina Huang	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Cathryn Domrose and Kurt Aguilar	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Kerrilyn Renshaw	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Emanuel Evans	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Hutchison Family	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Nathan Reynolds	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Shannon Beck	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Grace Lattyak	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Brian R Zaik	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Jenny Wang	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
	Lynn-Kai Chao	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Lymi Rai Chao	7					
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Lynn-Kai Chao	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
			200.00 200.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	

3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S	Cyle Piddington Kate S Carson Lisa M Brown Kirsten and David Marcus Matthew Wagner Lanet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei Lennifer Rosen Lanice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family Linoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le Christina Armatas	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Donation Directly by Give2SF 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$	Through SF Foundation	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S	Kate S Carson Lisa M Brown Kirsten and David Marcus Matthew Wagner Annet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei Jennifer Rosen Jennice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family Jinoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S	Kate S Carson Lisa M Brown Kirsten and David Marcus Matthew Wagner Annet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei Jennifer Rosen Jennice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family Jinoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 L 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S	Lisa M Brown Kirsten and David Marcus Matthew Wagner Anet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei Jennifer Rosen Janice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family Jinoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - - -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S	Kirsten and David Marcus Matthew Wagner anet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	- - -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Matthew Wagner anet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$	- - -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	anet Fung and Jimmy Do Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$ \$ \$ \$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 G 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 G 3/16/2020 G 3/16/2020 G 3/16/2020 S	Cara and Mike Leonardo Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 J 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Shectman Robinson Family Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00 200.00	\$		
3/16/2020 N 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Mariana Magalhaes Chapei ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00 200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	ennifer Rosen anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$ \$	200.00 200.00	<u> </u>		1
3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 JJ 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	anice A. McIntosh Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$ \$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S 3/16/2020 Ji 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Sutcliffe-Conaty Family inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$		+ i	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 Ji 3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	inoos Yazdany and Arash Anoshiravani Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A 3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Angela E Gonzalez Kristina Le		-	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Kristina Le	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S			200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 C 3/16/2020 S	Christina Armatas	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S		\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Caryl Shaw	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 N	Sarah Moss-Horwitz	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
-, .0, _0_0	Mike Rinaldi and Nicole Friedland	\$	200.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 T	The Kesteloots	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 R	Robert J Merck	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 P	Polly A. Stryker	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 C	Caroline Orsi	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 H	Hannah S Lee	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 J	effrey Erickson and Jacqueline Berger	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 T	The Smythe-Cullen Family	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K	Kathryn Arnold	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 N	Marlene Grenon	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 P	Patricia E Franks	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A	Anne Vaittinen	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	George and Rose Dobbins	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S	Seth and Julie Jacobs	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S	Sophia Zikanova	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 C	Clara Brenot and Olivier Godement	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 T	The Scanlas	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S	Sara N Cosenza	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 T	The Isbister Family	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 E	Eric Socolofsky	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S	Samuel James Maskell	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 S	Sokunthea Keo	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 R	Renee Di Cherri	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 L	aurence Berland	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A	Amanda Pinsker	\$	200.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 J	effrey M Moore	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 B	Benjamin W Redman	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 L	auren Patti	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A	Alon Gilat	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 K	Kristina and Alan Gonzalez	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 E	Ethan H Stone	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A	Anne Diaz	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Fric Walder and Alexandra Corvin	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 A	Allison N Jorges	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	isa Crossett	\$	150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	ohann and Kaoru Lynch	\$	150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Evan and Sally Kerrigan	\$	150.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Thomas Cruz	\$	150.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Pierre Urbain	\$	150.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	The Lemasters	\$	150.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Eric Proegler	\$	150.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	effrey A. Gray	\$	150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Samuel Feldman-Crough	\$	150.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Kirsten Irgens-Moller and Christopher Ho	\$	150.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
	/angchen Dolkar	\$	150.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending

			Donation	ı A	mount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	The Wald Family	\$	150.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mary Lou Licwinko	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sarah Leyde and Kevin Lang	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Filip Spiridonov	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tala Banatao	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Elizabeth Hartmann	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kelsey Stroshane	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Allison Carroll	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sarah and Jim Jones	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Asumu Takikawa	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kristy R Lee	\$	150.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	M. Lee Dixon	\$	125.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Unlimited Biking Rentals LLC	\$	125.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rui Wu and Tianyi Gou	\$	120.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Team Talbott	\$	120.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Patrick Holmes	\$	111.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Muneeb A Ahmad	\$	110.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Daniel E Medani	\$	110.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Brian Har	\$	110.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Paul Campbell	\$	109.02	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Catherine Davis	\$	108.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christopher Leader	\$	105.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Andrew Kaplan	\$	105.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vikram Raman	\$	101.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gurskis Hess Family	\$	101.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicholas E Beyrer	\$	101.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Natalie Schoch and Michael Mellody	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Emily Broas	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Maureen Haverty	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rayana Stanek	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	George C Rodgers	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aaron Beitch	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Decad Trust	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Oliver Raskin	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rachel Proctor	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Michael L Gummelt	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Charles E. Lowey-Ball	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kate L Hughes	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Keenan Rice	\$	100.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ivalina Demarco	\$	100.00		_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Patrick and Nicole Rodee	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Deirdre Anderson	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aleksandr Mistratov	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Chase Starr	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tyler Wozny	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Charles Lim	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rosie D Belpasso	\$	100.00	⊢÷		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Celine Cuevas	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Maxime Prades	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kristy E Leung	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	, ,	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Emily Kuhbach Alex, Jennifer and Simon Cohen	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rachel P Katz	\$		-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Dennis Biroscak	\$				Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020		\$	100.00	-		
	Andrew Gaffney	\$		-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Julia Doan		100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Douglas Hanlin and Kelvin Lynch	\$	100.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending
1 = (110 / //11//11)	Lewis Stringer	\$	100.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020		1 %	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Katrina Lake	+		*		Diselecture requirements of the control of the cont
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Michael Deninno	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020		+	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

816. 5			Donation	ı A		
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	Rebecca Wood	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nell Herbert	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sadie C Harmon	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer Lynch	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer E Raymond	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Trista Lacour	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jessica Fox	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Andrea Moore	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Patrick J Obrien	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Spencer Simonsen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Michael Sidgmore	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Bryce Goodman	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alexander Best	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Melissa and Ganesh Krishnan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Arvind Venkataramani	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Carol Rossi	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Louise Fong/William Bonham	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	The Kemper Family	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Janis Greenspan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Xin Xiao	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hongxia Li Tsai	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christina Hellmich	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Catherine Hilary White	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	The Campbell Family	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer A Stella	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Omid Mortazavi	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ingrid Ojeda	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lindsay Bruce	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer Liu	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	William Larsen	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Utsav Ahuja	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lindy and Erin Cunningham-McKnight	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Eva Gutierrez and Jason Holzheimer	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Steve Susoyev	\$	100.00	\$	=	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kimberly Quan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Eric H Panzer	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Dalel Nichole Jordan	\$	100.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	David Hurst	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Sergey Dubenko	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Suzanne Paige Sprincin The Navarros	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rebecca Yukelson	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Melissa Capria	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Evan Friel	\$	100.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tracy P. Leone	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Arlene Singer and Barbara Leff	\$	100.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Chenhung Wu	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kristen Nosky	\$	100.00	ı.		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Julie L Campioni	\$	100.00	<u> </u>		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vadim Geshel	\$	100.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sarah Schoellkopf	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Pingshun Huang	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aylene Bao	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	John Snyder	\$	100.00	÷		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Stephen Forte	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Bryan Quintero	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Joyce Sabel	\$		-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gail and Alan Venable	\$	100.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jeffrey E Trull	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alexandra Kutik	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
5, 10, 2020				ı.		
3/16/2020	Stephanie Dang	Ψ.	700 00 1	_	_	II JISCIOSUTE TEGLIESTED TESTIONSE DENDING
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Stephanie Dang Quang Duong	\$	100.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

		Donation	n /	Amount	
Gift Date	Donor Name	Directly by Give2SF	l	Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	Eileen Norman	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hornor Family	\$ 100.00	4	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Laurie Fitzgerald	\$ 100.00	٠,	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sarah Grossman-Swenson	\$ 100.00	4	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer Wu	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rachel Bonfanti	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jon Doellstedt	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Marie Que and John Scarpulla	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Justin Velo	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mary Prahl	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Casey S Barrett	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lindsay Hershenhorn	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Eloise M Bates	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Oliver Wilkie	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rashi King Abramson	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Stephanie Rose	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vlad and Natalie Blumen	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Julie Van Vliet	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Adrienne Cianfrocca	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicholas Kunst	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nadia R Baskett	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Broce Family	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Benjamin Peters	\$ 100.00	+	\$ <u> </u>	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ying Chen Chao	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Nathan Sheard Frank Dario Jones	\$ 100.00	+	\$ - \$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Daniel Leffel	\$ 100.00	+	<u>-</u> \$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Parissa Sayar	\$ 100.00	+	\$ - \$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jasmine Lawrence	\$ 100.00	+	\$ - \$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alyson Jacks	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jiasong Huang	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Francis Ellis	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	R Mark Thornton	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shotsy C Faust	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Doyle White	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Pettee Edna	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Caroline Nassif and Stephen Lynch	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sankaet Pathak	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alice Aronow	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	The Gellners	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vivien D'Andrea	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Melina A Wyatt	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Erin M Leviant	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ben Wu	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Pedro Lima	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicole Arata	\$ 100.00	4	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Annabelle Ho	\$ 100.00	4	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sarah Thompson	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Danil Panache	\$ 100.00	٠,	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Michael Lee	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	James Reffell	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lawrence Hosken	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shabnam Dadkhah	\$ 100.00		\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nauzli Dadkhah	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Teresa Ono	\$ 100.00	!	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Megan Crocker	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	David Liao	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Azis Abakirov	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christopher Nguyen	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Claudia Paz	\$ 100.00	-	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ben Tucker	\$ 100.00	+	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sattler Sattler	\$ 100.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Natalia A Fisher	\$ 100.00	:	\$ -	Disclosure requested, response pending

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 8/28/2020

			Donation	n A	Amount		
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by	ĺ	Through	Financial Interest With the City	
			Give2SF		SF Foundation		
3/16/2020	Gamvros Family	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ioannis Yiakoumis	\$	100.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Helen W. Bentley	\$	100.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Johannah Goldstein	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Leslie A Forrester	\$	100.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Nancy Duan	\$	100.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Emily Hague	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Annette and Kyle Lapham	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ingrid Flores	\$	100.00	+-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Thoma Grey	\$	100.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Edward Esslemont	\$	100.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Brian Lovin	\$	100.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	The Bastein Family	\$	100.00	+	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Juliana Devries	\$	75.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Alice Dutrut	\$	75.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Anna M Zylicz	\$	75.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ruth and Gene Greenwood	\$	74.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ben Tucker	\$	60.00	-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sheela Chandrasekhara	\$	51.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Rachael Morton	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Naomi Stoll	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Naomi Stoll	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sneha Krishna Sankavaram	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Danielle Simpson	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Brian A Carr	\$	50.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Yukiko Nishiguchi	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Pin-Ya Tseng	\$	50.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Suejin Kim	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Evan Gelfand	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Sophia Dermoutz	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Oi Man Ng	\$	50.00	ı,	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ahmet Emre Unal	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Alison Murphy	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Rebecca Brown	\$	50.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Carmen Cole	\$	50.00	ı,	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Alexis Luscutoff	\$	50.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Laura Yu	\$	50.00	٠.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Ann Cheung	\$	50.00 50.00	ı,		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Daria Maggio	\$		÷	•	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	The Sharma Family	\$	50.00	+			
3/16/2020	Michelle Tigchelaar Raina K Sheth	\$	50.00	٠.		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020 3/16/2020		\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Katherine and John Podesta	\$	50.00	+	•	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Lijesh Manjacheri Mahammad Gowawod	\$	50.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Mohammad Gowayyed Felicia Evans	\$	50.00	÷	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020		\$		+ -		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Lingamurthy Ravi Gwynne Stoddart	\$	50.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020		\$	50.00	+			
3/16/2020	Julia Peppiatt Karsten Weide	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020		\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
	Xiaotong Chi	 ' -		+		, , , ,	
3/16/2020	Sam Gould and Alexa Ball	\$	50.00	+	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Lynne Mathison Kathryn M Jereza	\$	50.00	+-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Kathryn M Jereza Michael Gangel	\$	50.00	+-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020		\$	50.00	+	•		
3/16/2020	Jeffrey J McClure	\$	50.00	+-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending	
	Bailey E Kass	\$		+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Alan Magary	\$	50.00	+			
3/16/2020	Melissa Woo	+	50.00	+ ·		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Melissa MacDonald	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Margaret Montgomery	-	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Michael and Lisa Palmo Moss	\$	50.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending	
3/16/2020	Michael Coren	4	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending	

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 8/28/2020

City Date	Danes Name		Donation	ı Aı		Financial Interest With the City
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	Idil Bereket	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Malia Young-Brohn	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Russell West	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ao Xu	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Stephanie Leduc	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kegan Garrison	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Michael Osofsky	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Daniel B Fuchs	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Joanna Siegall	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gabriel and Emma Dover	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shelley R Weisbrich	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Frank and Carol Buonagurio	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Yanwen Jiang	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ahern Family	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Dave Glidden	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Blair L Sirolli	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Julia Cheng	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Laura Hayes	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jeremy D Wood	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hannah Addario-Berry	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nathan Geer and Colby Croft	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kevin He	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Theresa Brown	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shahab Asghar	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rita Hao	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Earle McCartney	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Rachel M Alonso	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Stephanie Boudreau	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jonathan Hendler	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christopher Ota	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hartley Miller	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hannah Moskowitz	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hollis J Rich	\$	50.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Heather Sullens	\$	50.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Daniel Depaolo	\$	40.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Robert M Fruchtman	\$	40.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tara Lockhart	\$	40.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Beth S Bodner	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lauren Reda	\$	40.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hunter Blankenbaker	\$	40.00	\$	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jessica I Dell	\$	38.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Leah Swiler	\$	36.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Danne Duncan	\$	35.00	_	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alla Barkan	\$	30.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hayley Wyeth	\$	30.00	-	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Anthony and Lourdes Devigal	\$	30.00	<u> </u>	_	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christian Madden	\$	30.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicholas J Roberts	\$	30.00	_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alana N Fink	\$	30.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Safa Aliabadi	\$	30.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jennifer Collins	\$	26.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Michael E Fanning	\$	25.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alexandra Brown	\$	25.00			Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christopher D. Pappas	\$	25.00			Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Joan Lubamersky	\$	25.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Julia Baily	\$	25.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Alexandra Emrich	\$	25.00	-		
		\$		_		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Linda Jordan	\$	25.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Balakrishna Chennupati	\$	25.00	_	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Nancy A Tabor	⊅	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020		ď	25.00	đ		Disclosure requested response pending
3/16/2020 3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Connie Kwong Thaddeus Ballantine	\$	25.00 25.00	-	-	Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 8/28/2020

			Donation	ı A	Amount	
Gift Date	Donor Name		Directly by Give2SF		Through SF Foundation	Financial Interest With the City
3/16/2020	Juli Ann Carter	\$	25.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Dorit Grunberger	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Zachary Subin	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Travis Dittenber	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Matthew Dello Russo	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Paul Goodman	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Luis M Aroche	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shauna Odonnell	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicole Lycett	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Constance Channon	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sanchez Family	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Nicole C. Raeburn	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Vanessa J Bell	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Angela Glielmi	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Suzanne and Carlos Poma	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Blair J Davis	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tressa E Crozier	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aditya T Wresniyandaka	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Gabriel Paul Ortiz	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shawn Allen	\$	25.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jessica Da Silva	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Grace Gellman	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Hester Loo	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ryan Wong	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ti-Fen Pan	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Molly Fosco	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kyna Kellogg	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Adriana Villagran	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Antonio Martinez	\$	20.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Savannah Wagner Belk	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Irena Martinez	\$	20.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Danielle Bautista	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tracey Lin	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Aura Terrell	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jacqueline Chu	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Kyle and Jasmin Pimley	\$	20.00	\$	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Mike Huynh	\$	20.00	٠.		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Annie Pang	\$	20.00	\$	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Christina Hui Lin Feng	\$	20.00	\$		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Charuwan Pholsith	\$	20.00	-	•	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	David Abramsky	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Regina Coleman	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Shawn E Trombley	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Tyler Ochiai	\$	20.00	Η.		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Timothy J Oleneack	\$	20.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Jeremy Tsuchitani-Watson	\$	15.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Sharlene Baker	\$	10.00	+	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Benkay II Kajihara	\$	10.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Chase Reserve	\$	10.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	L. Bishop Photography	\$	10.00	+-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ann Huber	\$	10.00	+	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Elena Fromer	\$	10.00	+	·	Disclosure requested, response pending
		\$		+	·	, , , , ,
3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Noel Garcia	\$	10.00	H.		Disclosure requested, response pending
	Anton Kapralov	\$	10.00	-		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Lauren Jong Pyan Davids	\$		+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ryan Davids	-	5.00	٠.		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Ryan Davids	\$	5.00	1		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Maral Mara	\$	5.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	Maral Mara	\$	5.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending
2/1/2022	Frances Yap	\$	5.00	\$	-	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/16/2020	· ·	÷	F 00	-	†	Disalasura rasusastad
3/16/2020 3/16/2020 3/16/2020	Jolanta Zandecki Fe Valentin	\$	5.00 5.00	+		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Financial Interest With the City
8/18/2020	Amour Vert	Fabric Face Coverings	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
		j	21
8/18/2020	Medtec (New Taipei City)	Coveralls - White	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
			21
8/18/2020	Medtec (New Taipei City)	Gowns	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
, , , ,	1 1 1 1 1 3 7		21
8/18/2020	Medtec (New Taipei City)	Coveralls - White	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
			21
8/18/2020	Missioncare (New Taipei City)	Masks - Surgical	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
, , , , ,	, , ,		21
8/18/2020	Medtec (New Taipei City)	Shoe Covers	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
0, 10, 2020			21
8/18/2020	New Taipei City	Face Shields	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
0, 10, 2020	. tell raiper elley	Tace smelas	21
7/28/2020	Private Individual (John K Ng)	Surgical Masks	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
1,20,2020	· ····································	our great masks	21
7/23/2020	Saving Face	Face Shields	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
1,23,2323	Javing race	Tace smelas	21
7/15/2020	PCS	Peakfit 80102V N95 masks	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
1, 13, 2020	. 55	Todame so roz v ross masks	21
7/15/2020	Ironman Foundation	Non-sterile face masks	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
17 137 2020	in orimian i saniaation	Treat sterille race masks	21
7/13/2020	Seoul Municipal Government	Medical Grade coveralls and shoe covers	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
17 137 2020	Seedi Maineipai Geverninent	inicalcal drade coveralls and shoe covers	21
7/13/2020	Seoul Municipal Government	Pair shoe covers, 3M brand, universal size,	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
1, 13, 2020	Joseph Marine, par Government	#450	21
7/13/2020	Amour Vert	Fabric Face Coverings	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
, -, -		g.	21
7/6/2020	Pop's Foundation/SHP	Disposable Surgical Style Masks	None
, ,	Foundation		
7/2/2020	Athleta Inc.	Bandanna Masks	Disclosures will be requested by Q1 of FY2020-
, ,			21
6/16/2020	VM Ware	KN-95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	VM Ware	Hooded Isolation Suits	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Small 4/40's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Medium 4/40's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Large 4/40's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper X-Large 4/40's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper XX-Large 4/40's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Supply Bank Wet Wipes 12/100's	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/15/2020	Dick's Sporting Goods	Black Strap Cloth Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/10/2020	Timbuk2	Face Coverings	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/9/2020	United Healthcare	Fabric Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
6/8/2020 6/8/2020	Red Cross Mallory Safety and Supply	Bottles of Water Goggles	Disclosure requested, response pending A contract, grant or lease with Police
0/0/2020	ivialiory salety and supply	Ouggles	Department, Recreation and Park
			Department, SFPUC, SFMTA
6 /E /2020	PCS	Hand Canitizer Callege	
6/5/2020		Hand Sanitizer, Gallons	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/26/2020	SF Chinese Alliance Church	Level 1 Surgical Masks Handsewn Fabric Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Marine Layer		Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Bay Area Face Shield Supply	3D Printed Face Shields	Disclosure requested, response pending

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Financial Interest With the City
5/22/2020	Dry Ice Robotics	3D Printed Face Shields	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/22/2020	Private Individual (Kim Tirva)	40.5-ounce Refills of Foam Sanitizer for LTX-	Disclosure requested, response pending
	,	12 Touchless Dispensers	
5/22/2020	Timbuk2	Bandannas and Neck Gaiters	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/15/2020	Onfleet	Monthly Software Access From Onfleet	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Cloth Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Epidemic Protection Face Shields	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Impervious Isolation Gowns	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Cloth Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/14/2020	PCS	Vented N95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	Hazmat Suits (Dupont)	None
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	Safety Goggles (Condor Model 1VT70)	None
5/13/2020	Shanghai Hongbo Investment &	Disposable Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Management (Group) Co., Ltd	·	
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	KN95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	China Mobile International (USA)	Surgical Mask w/ Ear Loops	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Greenwich Terrace Householding	1 Gal. RX 20/20 Hand Sanitizer, 80% Alcohol	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/13/2020	Vietnam Consulate General	Fabric Face Coverings	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/12/2020	Culk	Fabric Face Masks	None
5/12/2020	Private Individual (Lou and	Boxes of Milton's Gluten-Free Crackers	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Suzanne Giraudo)		
5/12/2020	Private Individual (Lou and	Chocolate Chip Cookies	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Suzanne Giraudo)		
5/11/2020	Dickinson Corp.	3D Printed Face Shields	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/11/2020	Timbuk2 X CNBC	Face Coverings	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Private Individual (Yan Xiao)	Medical Gown	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	Private Individual (Yan Xiao)	Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/8/2020	SF Chinese Alliance Church	Level 1 Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/6/2020	Global Office	Face Shields	None
5/6/2020	HUB Group	Large Refrigerated Truck	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/5/2020	Private Individual (Jonica Little)	3D Printed Faceshields	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	BELLA+CANVAS	Fabric Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	Level 1 Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	3M N95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	San Huei N95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	EO Essentials	EO 40-ounce Unscented Hand Sanitizer	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/4/2020	SF Public Health Foundation	Boxed Lunch	A contract, grant or lease with Department of
			Public Health
5/1/2020	Marine Layer	Handsewn Fabric Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
5/1/2020	Private Individual (Colette Vance-	Fabric Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Wright)		
5/1/2020	Westpoint homes	Fabric Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/29/2020	Timbuk2 X CNBC	Timbuk2 Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/28/2020	Shanghai City Government	1,200 N95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/28/2020	Shanghai City Government	20,000 KN95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/28/2020	RealReal	Level 1 Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/27/2020	Consulate General of the People's	Escalier 3-Ply Single-Use Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
	Republic of China		
4/24/2020	Private Individual (Nikcole	Sunny Care Gloves, Size M	Disclosure requested, response pending
4/24/2020	i iivate iiiaiviaaai (i vikeole	5 a	Disclosure requested, response periamg

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Financial Interest With the City			
4/24/2020	Feysan Lodde	2 Pallets of 16.9-ounce Water Bottles	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/24/2020	Feysan Lodde	1 Pallet of Gallon Water Drums	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/24/2020	Hint, Inc	16-ounce Water Bottles	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/22/2020	Private Individual (Guo Zi Dai)	Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/22/2020	Comcast	Large Tote Bags	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/21/2020	WestPoint Home	Masks from Westpoint Home	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/21/2020	Private Individual (Nga Pham)	OEKO-TEX, Standard 100	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/21/2020	Timbuk2 X NBC Sports	Timbuk2 Face Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/20/2020	Timbuk2	Timbuk2 Bandannas	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/20/2020	Kerogen Capital	Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/20/2020	Fanatics	Surgical Mask w/ Ear Loops	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/17/2020	DWU Consulting LLC	Standard Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/17/2020	FitnessSF	FitnessSF Yowies	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	Anphu Pharma and Medical Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
		3M N95 8210 and 8710 Masks	, , , , ,			
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments		Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	Anphu Pharma Medical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	3M N95/8710 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/16/2020	Consulate General of the People's	Escalier 3-Ply Single-Use Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
	Republic of China					
4/16/2020	Apple	Face Shields	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/15/2020	Private Individual (Laurie Green)	3D Starbuss N95 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/14/2020	Comcast	Cloth Bags	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/13/2020	Elite Supply Source	Vinyl Aprons, Cordova #RA0bc48, Clear, Tied String, Sewn Edges	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/13/2020	Elite Supply Source	Disposable Sleeves, Cordova #PS18W2	Disclosure requested, response pending			
		White, 8-inch				
4/10/2020	PCS	Peakfit N95 Particulate Respirators	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/10/2020	PCS	Shoe Covers	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/9/2020	RainBeau	Handsewn Fabric Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/7/2020	AlterEco	Alter Eco Chocolates (Cases)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/7/2020	Seamsters Union	Handsewn Fabric Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/7/2020	Levi's	Handsewn Fabric Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/6/2020	Apple	Disposable Particulate Filter Respirators (Safety Director: 305050A NIOSH-approved)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
4/1/2020	One Medical	COVID-19 Test Kits (Swabs and Testing Media)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/27/2020	Dolby Laboratories	Waxie Shield Nitrile Powder-Free General- Purpose Gloves (W8644S) - Multiple Sizes	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/27/2020	Dolby Laboratories	SAS N95 Particulate Respirators (8625)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/27/2020	Endless West Spirits	Gallon Hand Sanitizer	Disclosure requested, response pending			
	·	Gallon Hand Sanitizer Gallon Hand Sanitizer	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/27/2020	Endless West Spirits		Disclosure requested, response pending Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/27/2020	Apple	Epic 40578-RS5 Masks with Ear Loop				
3/25/2020	Facebook	Clorox Bleach Cannisters	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip Gloves (Nitrile, XL)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip Gloves (Nitrile, L)	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Condor Safety Eyewear	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Hand Sanitizer Dispensers	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Germ Attack Hand Sanitizer, Gallon Refills	Disclosure requested, response pending			
3/25/2020	Facebook	Self-Priming Filter, FDA Approved, NIOSH-	Disclosure requested, response pending			

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Financial Interest With the City
3/25/2020	DoorDash	Uline S-9632 Standard Respirators	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/25/2020	Asian Art Museum Foundation	Purple Nitrile Gloves, Kimberley Clark,	Disclosure requested, response pending
		Medium	
3/25/2020	Asian Art Museum Foundation	Sperian One-Fit Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Roddy Lindsay	2 ounce CleanSF Sanitizer	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	Sperian One-Fit W1400 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	UniAir SH3500 Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	3-in-1 Valumax Disposable Ear Loop Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	Shoma Gloves (M)	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	Shoma Gloves (L)	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip (Nitrile, L)	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip (Nitrile, XL)	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	Gloves	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	Medical Gowns	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	Surgical Masks	Disclosure requested, response pending
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	Thermometers	Disclosure requested, response pending

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject:FW: Quarterly Power Report - September 2020Date:Wednesday, September 9, 2020 1:39:00 PM

Attachments: Quarterly Power Report Memo.pdf

Attachment A - List of Projects September 2020.pdf Attachment B - Map of Interconnection Issues.pdf Attachment C - Cost impacts September 2020.pdf

From: Imperial, Megan M < MImperial@sfwater.org>

Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 3:16 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

<angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>

Cc: Scarpulla, John (PUC) <JScarpulla@sfwater.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS)

<bos.legislation@sfgov.org>

Subject: Quarterly Power Report - September 2020

Dear Board of Supervisors staff,

Attached please find the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Quarterly Report to the Board of Supervisors (dated September 3, 2020) on the Status of Applications to PG&E for Electric Service. This report is being submitted in accordance with Resolution No. 227-18.

The following is a list of accompanying documents:

- 1. Quarterly Power Report Memo
- 2. Attachment A List of Projects September 2020
- 3. Attachment B Map of Interconnection Issues
- 4. Attachment C Cost Impacts September 2020

Hard copies of the quarterly report will be delivered to the Clerk's Office and your offices once the Shelter-in Place order has been lifted.

Best, Megan

Megan M. Imperial 竜芽願 Policy & Government Affairs Analyst San Francisco Public Utilities Commission 525 Golden Gate Ave., 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102

mimperial@sfwater.org

Office: 415-554-3241 | Mobile: 415-654-1654

Pronouns: She, Her, Hers



525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102 t 415.554.3155 f 415.554.3161 TTY 415.554.3488

September 3, 2020

Ms. Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board of Supervisors City Hall, Room 244 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Quarterly Report to the Board of Supervisors on the Status of Applications to PG&E for Electric Service.

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The attached quarterly report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Resolution No. 227-18, approved by the Board on July 10, 2018 (File No. 180693) and adopted on July 20, 2018.

Pursuant to Resolution No. 227-18, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is required to "provide the Board a quarterly report for the next two years that identifies the following: status of all City projects with applications to SFPUC for electric service, including project schedules and financing and other deadlines; project sponsor and SFPUC concerns in securing temporary and permanent power, including obstacles that could increase costs or delay service to City customers; and the status of disputes with PG&E before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) or in other forums." The SFPUC provides retail electric service from our Hetch Hetchy Power public utility to over 4,000 accounts, relying on our Hetch Hetchy generation for supply and purchased distribution service from PG&E. The SFPUC pays PG&E about \$10 million a year for this distribution service and another \$25 million to wheel the power on PG&E's transmission lines. The terms and conditions of the purchased distribution service are described in PG&E's Wholesale Distribution Tariff (WDT), as approved by FERC.

REPORT SUMMARY:

For the reporting period of April through August 2020, the SFPUC has identified 78 projects that have experienced interconnection delays, arbitrary requests for additional and/or unnecessary information, or increased project costs, as listed in **Attachment A**. Since the last quarterly report, 8 projects have been added and 10 projects have been energized.

London N. Breed Mayor

Ann Moller Caen President

Francesca Vietor Vice President

> Anson Moran Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell Commissioner

> Tim Paulson Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr. General Manager



OUR MISSION: To provide our customers with high-quality, efficient and reliable water, power and sewer services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care.

Any updates and changes to projects since the previous quarterly report are detailed in Column P of Attachment A. **Attachment B** contains a map providing the location of each project.

Attachment C contains a detailed report of each category of additional incurred costs and impacts to the City per project, such as redesign costs, construction and equipment costs, and additional staff time (also included in the 'Impacts' column of Attachment A). The total cost impacts to the City are now estimated to be more than \$12 million. Total costs do not include estimated costs for projects that are at a standstill as those costs are still to be determined.

ONGOING ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTION ISSUES:

Since the SFPUC submitted the first of these reports in October 2018, PG&E's treatment of City projects has not changed. The City continues to face major delays in PG&E's processing of its interconnection requests with PG&E. In addition, PG&E continues to require City projects to install oversized and cost prohibitive equipment without any regulatory, technical, safety or reliability justification.

Last quarter's report summarized the types of ongoing interconnection issues between the City and PG&E. Below is an update on these categories of disputes. Even though PG&E staff has been meeting with SFPUC staff on a weekly basis, there has been no movement on any of these issues.

- 1. *Delay tactics and cancellations stall City projects*: PG&E continues to delay City projects. Even for projects in which the City and PG&E agree on the service size, PG&E continues to ignore the WDT's timelines and terms set forth. There are at least three projects in which the City applied for primary service that have been delayed for over a year due to PG&E missing WDT deadlines.
- 2. Denial of City's requested capacity for interconnected load impacts essential City services: There has been no movement on projects in which PG&E is refusing to accept the City's requested interconnection capacity. The HOPE Affordable Housing Redevelopment projects remain at a standstill due to this issue.
- 3. Primary equipment requirements for small projects increase costs for the City: PG&E continues to require primary service for projects with load sizes that would normally be served by secondary service pursuant to PG&E's own technical guidelines, and as allowed under the WDT. The requirement that the City install primary service imposes major increases in costs, requires the City to install facilities that take up space that would otherwise be used for housing units or other uses specific to the project, leads to 'overbuilding' of the grid in San Francisco, and, in some cases, introduces safety concerns related to siting large electrical

equipment where it is not needed. PG&E cannot justify these requirements on technical, safety, reliability or regulatory grounds. In an effort to move some of the projects forward, the City has compromised by requesting low-side metering on some primary interconnections. No further projects have been approved for low-side metering since last quarter's report.

- 4. **Demands for costly and unnecessary upgrades to City projects:** Projects continue to be delayed or face increased project costs due to PG&E requiring the City to either install extra equipment or pay for upgrades to PG&E's own distribution system. PG&E has failed to provide adequate justifications for these requirements. Further, PG&E continues to withhold detailed information regarding design and costs that would allow the City to validate that the charges are necessary and appropriate.
- 5. Refusal to acknowledge the City's control of distribution facilities prohibits the City's growth: There has been no movement on the City's requests to PG&E to transfer customers to the City under the terms of the WDT. These requests are in compliance with the WDT as confirmed by FERC.

STATUS OF DISPUTES WITH PG&E BEFORE FERC:

As we previously informed you, on November 21, 2019, FERC issued an order in the City's 2014 complaint and related cases rejecting the City's claim that all of its load was eligible for service under the Federal Power Act without adding new facilities because the City had been serving the same customers for decade. On December 20, 2019, the City filed a request for rehearing of FERC's order. On June 4, 2020, FERC issued an order on rehearing that, for the most part, affirmed its prior order. The City has filed petitions to review these FERC orders with the Court of the Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Recently, the Court issued a scheduling order in those matters. We expect the matters to be fully briefed in early 2021.

In January 2020, the City and PG&E participated in an evidentiary hearing before a FERC Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) in a dispute over WDT service to an SFMTA substation at 6 Berry Street. The issues in that proceeding are: (i) whether PG&E is wrongfully charging the City for upgrades to its system; and (ii) whether PG&E's cost estimates lack sufficient detail. On July 2, 2020, the ALJ issued an initial decision in which the ALJ found for PG&E on the issue concerning the cost of upgrades and for the City on the issue concerning the cost estimates. Both the City and PG&E have filed exceptions to the initial decision asking FERC to reject the ALJ's rulings against them. We await a FERC decision.

On April 16, 2020, FERC issued an order dismissing the City's second complaint against PG&E in which the City claimed that PG&E violated its WDT by demanding

primary service for small loads. FERC found that PG&E has the discretion to grant or deny a request for secondary service based on the specifics of each particular request. The City has filed the required request for rehearing of FERC's order.

The City did receive one favorable ruling from FERC following the City's protest over PG&E's rejection of the City's request for a large capacity to serve a customer that had requested a transfer from PG&E retail service to SFPUC service. FERC found that "PG&E's WDT does not permit it to refuse to grant a customer's requested reserved capacity when available distribution capacity exists to meet the request."

Finally, PG&E recently sent a notice to San Francisco and its other wholesale customers that PG&E will file an update to its WDT after September 1, 2020 with FERC. We expect the update to include an increase in PG&E's wholesale rates in addition to revisions to some of the non-rate provisions in the WDT. The City and PG&E's other wholesale customers will be able to protest PG&E's update with FERC. We cannot say at this time how that update will impact the City's ability to obtain WDT service from PG&E for its loads.

Please find attached copies of the following documents related to this report:

- Attachment A: List of projects with active interconnection applications to PG&E for electric service as of August 2020
- Attachment B: Map of projects with PG&E power connection delays as of March 2020
- Attachment C: Cost impacts

Should you have any questions, please contact Barbara Hale, SFPUC Assistant General Manager for Power, at BHale@sfwater.org and 415-613-6341.

Sincerely,

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.

General Manager

	PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #	Client Organization	Project Description (what SF applied for)	Project Status	Initial Application Submittal Date	App Deemed Complete Date	Initial Service Need Date	Did PG&E require Primary?	Load Size/Can Be Served at Secondary	PG&E committed to work w/ SF to energize in 2018	Impacts	Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020)
1	114449998	600 32nd Avenue - George Washington High School	1		Upgrading and relocating existing secondary service	moving forward with		7/3/2019	9/1/2018	Yes	500 kW/Yes	х	Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)	Further delays caused by PG&E as they continue to push back the energization date. Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E.
2	115047431/11 5322749	4545 Anza Street - Lafayette Elementary	1		New temporary service for interim trailers and replacing existing secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with secondary service.	10/9/2018		7/1/2019	Yes	150 kW /Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Oct. 2018 - Oct. 2019 (1 year). Temp. power service for classroom trailers will be served by PG&E at retail - \$14k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$31k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. 50,000 lbs. of CO2 emissions (temporary period of 17 months)	No impacts update.
3	118155073	3401 Geary Blvd Streetlights and Traffic Controller	1		New temporary service for interim trailers and replacing existing secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E providing the Service Agreement late.	11////019	11/19/2019	2/3/2020	No	1 kW/Yes		Pedestrian and traffic safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these streetlights and traffic signals.	No impacts update.
4	112434942	3455 Van Ness Avenue - AWSS Pump Station No. 2	2	SFPUC - Water	Remove two existing services and replace with one secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	ion 12/9/2016	1/5/2017	8/1/2017	Yes	144 kW/Yes	х	Seismic improvements and architectural upgrades to increase reliability of the pumping station have been delayed. Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) Further delays caused by PG&E still not providing necessary cost detail to the Service Agreement (7 month delay).	No impacts update.
5	114713666	2110 Greenwich Street - Tule Elk Elementary	2		Upgrading and relocating existing secondary service		6/15/2018	4/2/2020	6/1/2019	Yes	300 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jun. 2018 - Oct. 2019 (14-15 months) Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)	Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E.
6	115675911	2445 Hyde St Francisco Park	2	SFRPD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	estimation 1/9/2019	4/7/2020	12/27/2019	Yes	70 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jun. 2019 - Oct. 2019 (3-4 months). Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) The project expects overhead/delay costs of at least \$168k (assuming a 30-day delay).	Delays continue as PG&E has still not provided the Service Agreement (was due in July 2020). The project is moving forward with construction at risk. Impacts updated to include expected overhead/delay costs.
7	PG&E withholding NN#	102 Marina Blvd Fort Mason (EVGo)	2	EVGo	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	a standstill. 12/13/2018		7/15/2019	Yes	600 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Dec. 2018 (17-18 months). If required, primary switchgear would cost the project an additional \$500k.	No update - project remains at a standstill.
8	111772188	Ferry Terminal	3	SFPORT for WETA	New secondary service		gistical //5/2016	6/20/2018	6/18/2017	Yes	150 kW/Yes	x	The Downtown Ferry Terminal is currently using power from the Agriculture Building. Delays of this service request could delay the redevelopment of the Agriculture Building. This would cause a delay to a build out of a new shorepower connection which would result in significant air pollution from up to 6 ferries idling in the berth. Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) Additional staff time for Port - \$32k Additional staff time for WETA - \$64k Costs of redesign - \$32k PG&E has caused further delays by not providing the service agreement on time (4+ months late)	PG&E's interconnection point may have large ramifications to project cost and timeline. The City has requested PG&E to look at alternate interconnection points and PG&E has refused.
9	117492329	950 Golden Gate Avenue - Margaret Hayward Park	3	SFRPD	Remove/replace existing transformer and utility boxes and provide new single secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	3/15/2018	6/5/2018	4/1/2020	Yes	100 kW/Yes		Project slightly delayed - project was in dispute from Mar. 2018 - May 2018. (2-3 months) Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) Further delays (6-8 weeks) as PG&E has informed the project of more inspections and work. The project expects overhead/delay costs of at least \$330k (assuming a 40-day delay).	Delays continue as the project is still not energized. Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E and expected overhead/delay costs.
10	115020677	88 Broadway - Affordable Housing (125 units)	3	MOHCD (BRIDGE Housing)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1) Further delays caused by PG&E mistake.	ion 10/1/2018	3/19/2019	12/2/2019	N/A	1674 kW/Yes		Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - $$618k$ in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. $$79k$ in additional power costs to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - $$150k$ (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) 1,090,000 lbs. of CO_2 emissions (construction period of 18 months)	No impacts update.

	PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #	Client Organization	Project Description (what SF applied for)	Project :	Status	Initial Application Submittal Date	App Deemed Complete Date	Initial Service Need Date	Did PG&E require Primary?	Load Size/Can Be Served at Secondary	PG&E committed to work w/ SF to energize in 2018	Impacts	Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020)
11	115019804	735 Davis - Affordable Housing (53 units)	3	MOHCD (BRIDGE Housing)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	In construction	10/1/2018	3/8/2019	12/2/2019	N/A	683 kW/Yes		Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$335k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$18k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) 554,000 lbs. of CO ₂ emissions (construction period of 19 months)	No impacts update.
12	114088011	Lake Merced Blvd & Sunset Blvd - Restroom	4	SFRPD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary.	Project Cancelled	12/8/2017		1/15/2019	Yes	10 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since late Aug. 2018. (4-5 months) Bathroom will not be available for public use at Lake Merced. Primary switchgear will cost the project an additional \$500k in equipment costs and take the space of parking spots.	Project Cancelled due to PG&E's new policy of requiring underground service for the area. The extensive costs of underground service for this bathroom is not feasible. Project will be removed in next quarter's report.
13	Several applications submitted	L Taraval - Streetlights	4	SFMTA	New secondary service (several streetlights)	Delays caused by PG&E being unresponsive.	In construction	3/19/2019	4/27/2019	1/1/2020	No	9.6 kW (per service point)/Yes		Pedestrian and traffic safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these streetlights. Project delayed - impacts TBD.	No impacts update.
14	PG&E withholding NN#	1351 42nd Street - Francis Scott Key Educator Housing (Construction and Perm. Power)	4	MOHCD (MidPen Housing)	New secondary service (one for construction and for permanent power)	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill. (both Construction and Perm. Power)	3/30/2020 (temp) 2/24/2020 (perm)		12/7/2020 (temp) 12/6/2021 (perm)	Yes	417 kW/Yes (temp) 678 kW/Yes (perm)		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Apr. 2020 (3-4 months).	Project added.
15	113135002	49 South Van Ness Avenue - Building Inspection and Permit Center	5	SFPW for ADM	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E failing to provide Service Agreement on time.	Energized	8/7/2017	11/10/2017	1/1/2019	N/A	5848 kW/No		Project delayed - SFPUC granted a time extension to PG&E of one extra month to provide Service Agreement. PG&E took an extra 4 months to provide the service agreement.	No impacts update. Project was energized and will be removed on next quarter's report.
16	114571079	50 Bowling Green Drive - GGP Tennis Center	5	SFRPD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	In construction	5/3/2018	10/3/2018	2/1/2019	Yes	160 kW/Yes	х	Project delayed - project was in dispute from May-July. 2018. (2-3 months) Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation), \$275k (for upgrades to PG&E's system) Lost gross revenue to SFPUC due to delays: \$1k Further delays may lead to possible funding issues.	Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E. Due to work scheduling delays, the project is at risk of missing its energization date (9/1/20) that is required for funding.
17	114907923	1251 Turk Street - Affordable Housing Fire Pump	5	MOHCD (TNDC)	New secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E not providing necessary cost detail.	Project is at a standstill.	8/17/2018	8/10/2019	2/17/2019	No	27 kW/Yes		Project delayed - PG&E is requiring \$250k plus trenching costs for a fire pump service that brings the existing affordable housing development up to code. It looks like PG&E is including upgrades to their own distribution system in the cost. SF is waiting for further cost justification.	Delays continue as PG&E still has not justified the need for distribution upgrades to replace a fire pump.
18	118155015	1805 Geary Blvd Streetlights and Traffic Signal	5	SFMTA	New secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E providing the Service Agreement late.	Service agreement issued by PG&E.	11/7/2019	11/19/2019	2/2/2020	No	1 kW/Yes		Pedestrian and traffic safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these streetlights and traffic signals.	No impacts update.
19	PG&E withholding NN#	78 Haight Street - Affordable Housing (Construction and Perm. Power)	5	MOHCD (TNDC)	New secondary service (one for construction and for permanent power)	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill. (both Construction and Perm. Power)	6/3/2020 (temp) 6/15/2020 (perm)		12/15/2020 (temp) 12/15/2021 (perm)	Yes	674 kW/Yes (temp) 315 kW/Yes (perm)		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Jun. 2020 (1 month) PG&E is requiring primary for the construction power and the permanent service.	Project added.
20	Several applications submitted	Haight Street Traffic Signals	5	SFMTA	New secondary services (several traffic signals)	Delays caused by PG&E cancelling the initial applications.	Engineering estimation by PG&E.	4/22/2020	7/16/2020					Project delayed as PG&E cancelled the original applications. Public safety is at risk as the traffic signal infrastructure is completed and are just awaiting energization. The public has been inquiring about signal activation status.	Project added.
21	111729695	6 Berry Street - Substation	6	SFMTA	Upgrade existing primary service	Delays caused by PG&E being unresponsive, changing requirements, and being non-transparent with costs and design changes.	Energized	6/17/2016	12/12/2016	5/1/2017	N/A	3000 kW/Yes		SFMTA completed the conduit boring under the rails prior to PG&E's approval. As such, parties disagree on costs and design requirements. SFMTA claims that they are incurring delay claims costs from contractor due to PG&E's failure to approve design and equipment submittals. (actual costs are still to be determined, but the costs continue to increase on a daily basis)	No impacts update. Project was energized in June 2020. The project team will be reaching out to connect the power the permanent substation in early 2021.
22	113826990	750 Brannan - Main Library Repository	6	SFPW for SFPL	Increase load request (237 kW to 500 kW)	Dispute over how to process increase in load request.	Service Agreement returned with payment by SFPUC.	11/14/2017	1/18/2018	1/1/2018	No	500 kW/Yes		Plans for a new HVAC system at the library repository have been delayed. No monetary impact - however, SF believes that PG&E's requirements for approving load increase for muni loads is extensive and will cause delays to projects.	No impacts update.
23	118152147	399 The Embarcadero - Fire Boat #35	6	SFFD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	project site and presents logistical	1/14/2019	2/8/2020	12/27/2019	Yes	430 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jan. 2019 - Oct. 2019 (8-9 months). Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) If the project is forced to use PG&E's proposed interconnection point (not the project team's proposed point), the project team expects additional construction costs of \$1.8M and delay costs of \$500k.	Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E and expected costs of using PG&E's proposed interconnection point.
24	TBD	16th & Terry Francois Blvd Mission Bay Ferry Landing	6	SFPORT	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service Agreement issued by PG&E.	6/30/2019	3/6/2020	1/3/2020	Yes	100 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jan. 2019 - Oct. 2019 (8-9 months). Additional staff time for Port - \$70k (from original application that was cancelled) Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) Costs of redesign - \$30k (from original application that was cancelled)	Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E.

	PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #	Client Organization	Project Description (what SF applied for)	Project	Status	Initial Application Submittal Date	App Deemed Complete Date	Initial Service Need Date	Did PG&E require Primary?	Load Size/Can Be Served at Secondary	PG&E committed to work w/ SF to energize in 2018	Impacts	Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020)
25	115071498	555 Larkin (formerly 500 Turk) - Affordable Housing (108 units)	6	MOHCD (TNDC)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service Agreement returned with payment by SFPUC.	10/15/2018	12/18/2019	7/1/2020	Yes	890 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Nov. 2018 - Oct. 2019 (11-12 months). Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$402k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$9k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) 643,000 lbs. of CO2 emissions (construction period of XX months)	No impacts update.
26	116790877	Market St. & 7th St - BMS Switch	6	SFMTA	New secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E not following WDT timelines and not providing cost explanations.	Service Agreement issued by PG&E.	3/6/2019	4/9/2019	1/4/2021	No	48 kW/Yes		Project delayed - PG&E was late in providing the service agreement and has been unresponsive in providing further cost explanation.	No impacts update.
27	TBD	1064 Mission St Affordable Housing (256 units)	6	MOHCD (Mercy Housing)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service Agreement returned with payment by SFPUC.	3/28/2019	12/18/2019	4/1/2021	Yes	678 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Feb. 2019 to Oct. 2019 (7-8 months). Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$986k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$89k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. 1,681,000 lbs. of CO2 emissions (construction period of 18 months)	No impacts update.
28	N/A	Transbay Transit Center - Transbay Joint Powers Authority	6	SFPUC - Power	Two new primary services (5 MW each)	Potential dispute over reserved capacity.	Energized - PG&E reviewing SF's request.	9/12/2018	2/6/2019	10/1/2018	N/A	10 MW/No		PG&E is currently reviewing SF's request to use 10 MW of reserved capacity that SF applied and paid for. If PG&E denies request, SF may incur additional costs or have to limit the tenants. PG&E is holding up the project by not explaining the discrepancies between its System Impact Study draft agreement to what SF had requested.	Delays continue as PG&E has still not adequately responded to SF's questions regarding load calculations in the System Impact Study draft agreement.
29	114491666	Mission Rock & Terry Francois Blvd Redevelopment Project	6	SFPUC - Power	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing Service Agreement.	Engineering estimation by PG&E.	4/9/2018	4/20/2018	8/1/2019	N/A	7300 kW/No		Project delayed - PG&E should have provided the Service Agreement by end of August 2019.	Delays continue as PG&E still has not provided the Service Agreement.
30	117795024	16 Sherman Street - Victoria Park Lighting	6	SFRPD	Upgrading existing secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E providing the Service Agreement late.	Service Agreement issued by PG&E.	10/30/2019	11/20/2019	2/15/2020	N/A	42 kW/Yes		Park safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these lighting fixtures.	No impacts update.
31	110299505	4- 8 Guy Place - Guy Place Park	6	SFRPD	New secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E providing inconsistent information.	Energized	IN FLIGHT (Prior to July 2015)	N/A	N/A	No	N/A		Project delayed - impacts TBD.	No impacts update. Project was energized in June 2020 and will be removed on next quarter's report.
32	PG&E withholding NN#	180 Jones Street - Affordable Housing	6	MOHCD (TNDC)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	4/28/2020		9/5/2022	Yes	576 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since May 2020 (2-3 months).	Project added.
33	PG&E withholding NN#	266 4th Street - Affordable Housing	6	MOHCD (TNDC)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	6/15/2020		12/1/2021	Yes	700 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since June 2020 (1-2 months).	Project added.
34	PG&E withholding NN#	2685 Ocean Ave EV Charging Station	7	SFMTA & EVGo	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	2/4/2019		7/22/2019	Yes	600 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Feb. 2019 (16-17 months). If required, primary switchgear would cost the project an additional \$500k.	No update - project is still at a standstill. PG&E is now threatening to cancel this project.
35	TBD	5 Lenox Way - West Portal Elementary School	7	SFUSD	Upgrade existing secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service Agreement issued by PG&E.	7/26/2019	3/10/2020	6/14/2021	N/A	400 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from July 2019 - Oct. 2019 (2-3 months) Additional project costs - \$150k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation)	No impacts update.
36	113135782	350 Amber Drive - Police Academy	8	SFPW for SFPD	Upgrade existing secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service Agreement returned with payment by SFPUC.	8/8/2017	5/22/2018	TBD FYE22	Yes	160 kW/Yes	х	Project delayed - project was in dispute from Dec. 2017 - May 2018 (6 months). Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation)	No impacts update. SF has asked PG&E for a project extension.
37	114315107	4235 19th Street - Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy	8	SFUSD	Upgrading and relocating existing secondary service		Energized	2/12/2018	7/12/2019	9/1/2019	Yes	300 kW/Yes	х	Project delayed - project was in dispute from Feb. 2018 - Jun. 2018. (3-4 months). Safety improvements and the construction of a new building have been delayed as a result. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) Further design delays will impact the project construction budget and timeline.	Impacts updated to include a second interrupter (an additional \$75k) required by PG&E. Project was energized in August 2020 and will be removed on next quarter's report.
38	114149145	1271 Treat Avenue - Garfield Pool	9	SFRPD	Upgrading and relocating existing secondary service		Energized	12/28/2017	8/17/2018	5/1/2018	Yes	200 kW/Yes	х	Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jan. 2018 - May 2018. (3-4 months) Additional project costs - \$250k (interrupter, #7 box, transformer, main switchboard, installation, & trenching)	No impacts update. Project was energized in April 2020 and will be removed on next quarter's report.


Part									, tetae	A. LIST OF THE			
		PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #			Project Status	Application Submittal	Complete		require	Be Served at	committed to work w/ SF to Impacts Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020) energize in
	39	113773996	,	9	SFPW for GSA	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project in construction moving forward with	10/25/2017	2/12/2019	8/1/2020	Yes	818 kW/Yes	Additional construction costs - \$150k Impacts updated to better represent actual costs instead
Part	40	114248007	Affordable Housing	9	,	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	1/18/2018	3/11/2019	9/2/2019	Yes	617 kW/Yes	PG&E retail temporary power for construction was also delayed by a few months. Costs for primary redesign (and then low-side metering)- \$45k Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$294k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$81k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation) 623,000 lbs. of CO ₂ emissions (construction period of 18 months)
Part	41	114232705	Avenue - Affordable	9	,	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	1/16/2018	3/8/2019	10/1/2019	Yes	867 kW/Yes	Project delayed - project was in dispute from Feb. 2018 - Nov. 2018. (8-9 months) Costs for redesign (primary service with low-side metering) - \$15k Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$145k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$43k in additional power costs to project due to PG&E's higher rates. 294,000 lbs. of CO ₂ emissions (construction period of 16 months) 740,000 lbs. of CO ₂ emissions from four months of generator use. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)
Moderate Procures 1	42	114671141	Affordable Housing	9	MOHCD (MEDA)	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	5/18/2018	3/14/2019	1/15/2020	Yes	1387 kW/Yes	Costs for redesign (primary service with low-side metering) - \$2-3k Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$581k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$8k in additional power costs to project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)
A	43	withholding	Affordable Housing	9	MOHCD (MEDA)	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	2/6/2019		8/3/2020	Yes	785 kW/Yes	Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$657k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$166k in additional power costs to project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)
Spot 3001-302 247h St. Affortishe Housing 19 Month (Differ) New secondary survive (Secondary Survive (Australian Management of the Survive (Australian Management (Secondary Survive (Australian Manag	44	114345033	Affordable Housing	9	MOHCD (MEDA)	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	2/26/2018	3/14/2019	9/1/2020	Yes	920 kW/Yes	Costs for redesign (primary service with low-side metering) - \$2-3k Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail - \$563k in lost gross revenue to SFPUC. \$29k in additional power costs to project due to PG&E's higher rates. Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, 2 #7 boxes, & installation)
4 mithoding and parties street withholding and parties street points with bloomy Mission Branch Library Mission Br	45	115148446	Affordable Housing	9		New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See	11/1/2018		9/1/2020	Yes	362 kW/Yes	for low-side metering is no longer viable to meet project
47 111975801 BO Amador Street- Pier 94 - Backlands	46	withholding		9	SFPL	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is at a standstil	l. 2/26/2020		9/1/2020	Yes	190 kW/Yes	
2241 Jerrold Avenue - Ambulance Deployment Facility Park been delayed as a result. 48 113934715 Park of SFPW for SFFD Delays caused by PG&E requiring primary. Secondary service for construction) 49 112774763 Prancois - Mariposa Pump Station 50 114408260 Polyment Facility Park of SFPW for SFFD Delays caused by PG&E and to avoid anymore delays. The polyment facility have been delayed as a result. 48 113934715 Park of SFPW for SFFD Delays caused by PG&E requiring primary. Project work of PG&E retail service. 50 114408260 Polyment Facility Park of SFPW for SFFD New secondary service of Delays caused by PG&E retail service. 51 114408260 Polyment Facility Park of SFPW for SFFD New secondary service of Delays caused by PG&E requiring primary. Project team is potentially facing construction period of 36 months) 5241 Jerrold Avenue - Ambulance deployment facility have been delayed as a result. Additional project costs - 575k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) Costs of redsign - 5100k Costs of construction delays - 5250k Additional project costs of the rew ambulance deployment facility have been delayed as a result. Additional project delayed - 585k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) No impacts update. Project was energized in August 202 Costs of construction delays - 5250k Additional Staff Time for 5FPW - 5100k Lost gross revenue to SFPUC. Power Project delayed - project delayed - project delayed - project due to pedialys. The project	47	111975801		10	SFPORT	New secondary service	PG&E required primary. Project is moving issues remain on land forward with primary service. Issued by PG&E, but issues remain on land rights. (Project now or hold due to COVID	8/19/2016	8/28/2018	2/1/2017	Yes	166 kW/Yes	The Port is investing over \$8M in upgrading the 16-acre parcel in the Backlands project site. The Port is expected to generate approximately \$250k in monthly rent revenue from this site. Significant delays to this project can cause the Port to lose \$3M in revenue annually. Additional staff time for Port - \$50k This project is now on hold. This location has been used the emergency shelters for the homeless in response to COVID. The issues regarding the permanent power service still remain.
Hillinois St. & Terry Francois - Mariposa Pump Station SFPUC - Wastewater 10 SFPUC - Power North 11 SFPUC - Power North 12 SFPUC - Power North 13 SFPUC - Power North 14 SFPUC - Power North 14 SFPUC - Power North 15 SFPUC - Power North 16 July 18 July 2017 17 SFPUC - Power North 18 July 2017 19 SFPUC - Power North 19 SFPUC - Power North 10 SFPUC	48	113934715	Ambulance	10	SFPW for SFFD	New secondary service	dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward at lowside metering. (See	3/9/2017	2/8/2018	1/1/2018	Yes	300 kW/Yes	plans for the new ambulance deployment facility have been delayed as a result. Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) Costs of redesign - \$100k Costs of construction delays - \$250k Additional Staff Time for SFPW - \$100k
50 114408260 Represe North 10 SFPUC - Power New primary service cancelling the cancelling the cancelling the project is at a standstill. 3/12/2018 N/A 12,000 kW/No application	49	112774763	Francois - Mariposa	10		secondary service (for	requiring primary. Project went to PG&E retail to avoid anymore PG&E retail service.	4/13/2017		6/1/2018	Yes	169 kW/Yes	PG&E delaying temp. power - project team is potentially facing contract delay costs of \$1k/day. X \$22k in additional power costs to the project due to PG&E's higher rates. 554,000 lbs. of CO2 emissions (construction period of 36 months) Further delays - PG&E is not providing temporary power time. The project team is looking into mitigating construction contract delay costs by using a generator.
	50	114408260		10	SFPUC - Power	New primary service	cancelling the Project is at a standstill	J. 3/12/2018		10/1/2018	N/A	12,000 kW/No	INO IMPACTS UDGATE - PGATE FETUSES TO DROVIDE SERVICE.

	PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #	Client Organization	Project Description (what SF applied for)	Project	Status	Initial Application Submittal Date	App Deemed Complete Date	Initial Service Need Date	Did PG&E require Primary?	Load Size/Can Be Served at Secondary	PG&E committed to work w/ SF to energize in 2018	Impacts	Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020)
51	114408263	638 23rd Street - Potrero South	10	SFPUC - Power	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E cancelling the application.	Project is at a standstill.	3/12/2018		10/1/2018	N/A	12,000 kW/No		Project delayed - PG&E denied this service request citing inadequate capacity and cancelled the application.	No impacts update - PG&E refuses to provide service.
52	114713787	1001 22nd Street - Bus Electrification Pilot	10	SFMTA	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing the Service Agreement.	Service agreement issued by PG&E.	6/18/2018	2/14/2019	5/1/2019	N/A	2400 kW/Yes		Initially, PG&E was unresponsive in scheduling a pre-application meeting which has caused some delays. PG&E was also late in providing a deemed complete date for the application and several months late in providing the Service Agreement.	Further delays incurred as PG&E was several months late in providing the Service Agreement.
53	112828717	2 Rankin Street - Central Bayside Pump Station	10	SFPUC- Wastewater	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E failing to provide Service Agreement on time.	Project Cancelled	5/1/2017	8/17/2017	6/1/2019	N/A	7000 kW/No		Project delayed - SF granted a time extension to PG&E of one extra month to provide Service Agreement. PG&E took an extra 4 months. Project incurred more delays as PG&E was late in providing the Facility Study draft agreement. Service need date is jeopardized.	Project has been cancelled and will be removed on the next quarter's report.
54	114671200	1995 Evans - Traffic Controls and Forensics	10	SFPW for SFPD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	Service agreement issued by PG&E.	5/18/2018	9/3/2019	3/1/2020	Yes	2100 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jun. 2018 to August. 2019 (13-14 months). Temp. construction power service by PG&E at retail has been delayed causing the project team to use generators Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation) Generator costs for temp power: \$578k Additional delays caused by pole location issues.	Delays continue as SF and PG&E continue to work out pole location issues.
55	110162018	750 Phelps - Southeast Plant	10	SFPUC- Wastewater	New primary service	Potential delay as PG&E is late in providing SIS agreement.	PG&E working on Facility Study report.	IN FLIGHT (Prior to July 2015)	7/14/2018	5/20/2020	N/A	12000 kW/no		If delays continue and jeopardize the project energization date, the project team will incur a liquidated damage amount of \$3000/day.	Delays continue as PG&E is several months late in providing the Facility Study report.
56	114546573	2401/2403 Keith Street - Southeast Health Center	10	SFPW for SFDPH	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	In construction	4/27/2018	11/14/2019	7/26/2020	Yes	200 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from May 2018 - Oct. 2019 (16-17 months). Additional project costs - \$150k (2 interrupters, #7 box, & installation)	Impacts updated to include the second interrupter that PG&E is requiring (an additional \$75k).
57	115415116	1550 Evans Ave Southeast Community Center	10	SFPUC	Relocation and upgrade of existing secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward at low- side metering. (See Note 1)	In construction	11/26/2018	5/22/2019	1/4/2021	Yes	800 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Dec. 2018 - Oct. 2019 (8-9 months). PG&E is now 2 months late in providing the Service Agreement. Added costs for primary equipment - \$500k	No impacts update.
58	TBD	Islais Creek Bridge Rehab (3rd Street)	10	SFPW	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	SF working on updated application.	4/2/2019		5/1/2021	Yes	104 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Mar. 2019 - Oct. 2019 (6-7 months). Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation)	No impacts update.
59	PG&E withholding NN#	1150 Phelps - Construction Trailers	10	SFPUC	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	5/1/2019		6/1/2019	N/A	472 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since May 2019 (14-15 months) If required, primary switchgear would cost the project an additional \$500k.	No update - project is still at a standstill. PG&E is now threatening to cancel this project.
60	114721804	480 22nd Street - Pier 70 Pump Station	10	SFPUC - Power		Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing Service Agreement.	Engineering estimation by PG&E.	6/14/2018	10/26/2018	1/1/2019	N/A	2000 kW/Yes		Project delayed - PG&E should have provided Service Agreement by end of August 2019.	Delays continue as PG&E has still not provided the Service Agreement.
61	112875227	1601 Griffith Street - Griffith Pump Station	10	SEPUC - Water	energization	Delays caused by PG&E providing energization late.	Energized - Cost impacts due to delay in energization.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Project delayed - PG&E pushed back the energization date by 2 weeks. Due to PG&E's delay, the project had to use generators for an additional 2 weeks costing \$27k.	No impacts update.
62	114919920	Harmonia Street - Sunnydale HOPE	10	SFPUC - Power	New primary service	Potential dispute over reserved capacity.	System Impact Study phase of engineering estimation by PG&E.	8/16/2018	4/4/2019	8/1/2020	N/A	1000 kW/Yes		Delays caused by PG&E not responding to SF's questions regarding load calculations in the System Impact Study draft agreement.	Delays continue as PG&E has still not adequately responded to SF's questions regarding load calculations in the System Impact Study draft agreement.
63	115583820	1101 Connecticut Street - HOPE Potrero	10	SFPUC - Power	New primary service	Potential dispute over reserved capacity.	System Impact Study phase of engineering estimation by PG&E.	12/13/2018	4/4/2019	6/1/2019	N/A	4000 kW/No		Delays caused by PG&E not responding to SF's questions regarding load calculations in the System Impact Study draft agreement.	Delays continue as PG&E has still not adequately responded to SF's questions regarding load calculations in the System Impact Study draft agreement.
64	113804831	603 Jamestown Avenue - Redevelopment Project	10	SFPUC-Power	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing Service Agreement.	Engineering estimation by PG&E.	11/2/2017	2/26/2018	10/1/2018	N/A	8000 kW/No		Delays caused by PG&E not providing the Service Agreement on time.	Delays continue as PG&E has still not provided the Service Agreement.
65	116967240	702 Phelps Street - SFMTA Substation	10	SFMTA	Request to increase loads	Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing the System Impact Study report.	System Impact Study phase of engineering estimation by PG&E.	2/26/2019	6/28/2019	5/1/2019	N/A	4000 kW/No		Delays caused by PG&E not providing the System Impact Study report on time. More delays caused by PG&E not providing the Service Agreement on time.	Delays continue as PG&E is several months late in providing the Service Agreement (due date was end of May 2020).
66	11742971	1800 Jerrold Avenue - Biosolids (Temp. power)	10	SFPUC- Wastewater	New primary service	Delays caused by PG&E being late in providing the Service Agreement.	Service Agreement returned with payment by SFPUC.	5/16/2019	6/28/2019	10/1/2019	N/A	1441 kW/No		Delays caused by PG&E not providing the Service Agreement on time.	No impacts update.
67	117974199	901 Tennessee Street - Streetlights	10	SFMTA	New secondary service	Delays caused by PG&E providing the Service Agreement late.	Engineering estimation by PG&E.	2/1/2019	11/20/2019	8/1/2019	No	1 kW/Yes		Pedestrian and traffic safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these streetlights and traffic signals.	No impacts update.

	PG&E NN#	Project Location	District #	Client Organization	Project Description (what SF applied for)	Project	Status	Initial Application Submittal Date	App Deemed Complete Date	Initial Service Need Date	Did PG&E require Primary?	Load Size/Can Be Served at Secondary	PG&E committed to work w/ SF to energize in 2018	Impacts	Updates/Changes since Last Report (April 2020)
68	N/A	1508 Bancroft Ave Sustainable Streets Shops	10	SFMTA	Request for information on existing PG&E power supply and approval from PG&E to use the current breakers	Delays caused by PG&E being unresponsive.	Project is on hold as SF is waiting for PG&E response.	4/6/2018	N/A	10/21/2019	No	N/A		Potential power issue - SF cannot confirm that the current power system is properly protected without PG&E's response to the information requested.	No impacts update.
69	Several applications submitted	Mission Bay Loop - Streetlights	10	SFMTA	New secondary service (several streetlights)	Delays caused by PG&E being unresponsive.	Energized	9/27/2019	8/6/2019	12/17/2019	No	9.6 kW (per service point)/Yes		Pedestrian and traffic safety is at risk as PG&E delays the energization of these streetlights.	No impacts update. Project is energized and will be removed on next quarter's report.
70	PG&E withholding NN#	1001 Potrero Avenue - UCSF/SFGH Research & Academic Building Construction and Perm Power	10	UCSF/SFGH	New secondary service (for construction) New primary service (for permanent)	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Construction power is at a standstill. Perm. power is moving forward.	5/20/2020 (temp) 4/1/2020 (perm)		1/1/2021	Yes	417 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Jun. 2020 (1-2 months).	Project added.
71	114529750	1920 Evans - Arborist Trailer/BUF Yard	10	DPW	New secondary service	Delays caused by issues with overhead poles.	Service Agreement issued by PG&E.	4/16/2018	8/10/2018	10/1/2018	No	37 kW/Yes		Project has been delayed due to issues with an overhead pole. PG&E's proposed design was not feasible as it required overhead poles to be installed above underground sewer utilities.	Project added.
72	PG&E withholding NN#	4840 Mission Street - Affordable Housing (Construction and Perm. power)	11	MOHCD (BRIDGE Housing)	New secondary service (one for construction and for permanent power)	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill. (both Construction and Perm. Power)	2/5/2020		11/1/2022	Yes	1621 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Feb. 2020 (4-5 months). PG&E is requiring primary for the construction power and the permanent service.	Delays continue as PG&E is still requiring primary switchgear for this project.
73	PG&E withholding NN#	35-45 Onondaga Avenue - Health Clinic	11	Real Estate (for DPH)	Upgrade and relocation of existing secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	6/1/2020		6/7/2021	Yes	144 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Jun. 2020 (1-2 months)	Project added.
74	PG&E withholding NN#	241 Oneida Ave Denman Middle School	12	SFUSD	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project moving forward with low-side metering. (See Note 1)	PG&E working on System Impact Study.	9/6/2019		6/7/2021	Yes	1250 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Sept. 2019 to Dec. 2019 (2-3 months) Additional project costs - \$75k (interrupter, #7 box, & installation)	No impacts update.
75	PG&E withholding NN#	2340 San Jose Ave Affordable Housing	12	MOHCD (Mission Housing)	New secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project is at a standstill.	11/21/2019		5/1/2020	Yes	800 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project has been in dispute since Jan. 2020 (6-7 months)	Delays continue as PG&E is still requiring primary switchgear for this project.
76	N/A	Multiple Locations - Guy Wires (Franchise Issue)	N/A	SFMTA, SFPW, & SFPUC	PG&E's guy wires are impeding on SF projects.	Franchise dispute	Project is moving forward.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		PG&E's unresponsiveness in removing guy wires is an obstruction to SF projects. 1) SFMTA cannot install a pole replacement to promote safety. 2) SFPW cannot construct a new ADA curb ramp. 3) SFPUC cannot finish parts of construction at the Southeast Water Treatment Plant.	Delay continues for two of the requests. SF and PG&E will continue to work together to get these resolved.
77	N/A	Multiple Service Transfers	N/A	Various City Depts	. Service Transfers	Delays caused by PG&E requiring unnecessary equipment or information for service transfer requests.	Project is at a standstill.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Additional costs and staff resources can be incurred if PG&E continues to create barriers for SF service transfer requests. SF continues to experience loss of revenue and increased greenhouse gas emissions as PG&E is refusing to transfer over City department loads.	Delays continue as projects remain at a standstill.
78	N/A	10501 Warnerville Road - Substation Rehabilitation Project	N/A - Oakdale	SFPUC	Remove two existing services and replace with one secondary service	Delays caused by dispute over primary vs. secondary. Project is still in dispute.	Project went to PG&E retail.	12/26/2018	N/A	3/1/2019	Yes	160 kW/Yes		Project delayed - project was in dispute from Jan May 2019 (4 -5 months).	Project will now be served by PG&E retail service to avoid delays. Cost impacts and greenhouse gas emission impacts are TBD.

ATTACHMENT B – MAP OF INTERCONNECTION ISSUES





Attachment C: Cost Impacts

	А	В	C)		E		F	G			Н		I	J
			Additional Costs to Project							Other Impacts t			mpacts to SF				
	Project Location	Redesign Costs	Prima Low-s Mete Equipr Cos	side ring ment	Addit Constru Cos	uction	Cos Proje PG&E	tional ts to ect for retail vice	Con	additional nst./Project gmt Costs re to Delay	Addition Staff T	ime	Pro	al Additional oject Costs C+D+E+F+G)	re	ost gross venue to SFPUC	CO2 Emissions (lbs) from PG&E retail service
1	600 32nd Avenue - George Washington High School			0,000	\$ 1,0	00,000							\$	1,150,000			
2	4545 Anza - Lafayette Elementary						\$	31,000					\$	31,000	\$	14,000	50,000
3	3401 Geary Boulevard												\$	-			
4	3455 Van Ness Avenue - AWSS Pump Station No. 2		\$ 7	5,000									\$	75,000			
5	2110 Greenwich Street - Tule Elk Elementary		\$ 150	0,000									\$	150,000			
6	2445 Hyde Street - Francisco Park		\$ 7	5,000					\$	168,000			\$	243,000			
7	102 Marina Boulevard - Fort Mason (EVGo)												\$	-			
8	Ferry Terminal	\$ 32,000	\$ 7	5,000							\$ 9	6,000	\$	203,000			
9	950 Golden Gate Avenue - Margaret Hayward Park		\$ 150	0,000					\$	330,000			\$	480,000			
10	88 Broadway - Affordable Housing		\$ 150	0,000			\$	79,000					\$	229,000	\$	618,000	1,090,000
11	735 Davis - Affordable Housing		\$ 150	0,000			\$	18,000					\$	168,000	\$	335,000	554,000
12	Lake Merced Blvd & Sunset Blvd - Restroom												\$	-			
13	L Taraval - Streetlights												\$	=			
14	1351 42nd Street - Affordable Housing (Francis Scott Key Educator Housing)												\$	-			
15	49 South Van Ness Avenue - Building Inspection Office												\$	-			
16	50 Bowling Green Drive - GGP Tennis Center		\$ 150	0,000	\$ 2	75,000							\$	425,000	\$	1,000	
17	1251 Turk Street - Affordable Housing Fire Pump				\$ 2	50,000							\$	250,000			
18	1805 Geary Blvd Streetlights and Traffic Signal												\$	-			
19	78 Haight Street - Affordable Housing												\$	-			
20	Haight Street Traffic Signals												\$	-			
21	6 Berry Street - Substation												\$	-			
22	750 Brannan - Main Library Repository												\$	-			
23	399 The Embacadero - Fire Boat #35		\$ 150	0,000	\$ 1,8	00,000			\$	500,000			\$	2,450,000			
24	16th & Terry Francois Blvd Mission Bay Ferry Landing	\$ 30,000	\$ 150	0,000							\$ 7	0,000	\$	250,000			
25	555 Larkin (formerly 500 Turk Street) - Affordable Housing		\$ 150	0,000			\$	9,000					\$	159,000	\$	402,000	643,000
26	Market St. & 7th St BMS Switch												\$	-			
27	1064 Mission Street - Affordable Housing		\$ 150	0,000			\$	89,000					\$	239,000	\$	986,000	1,681,000
28	Transbay Transit Center - Transbay Joint Powers Authority												\$	-			
29	Mission Rock & Terry Francois Blvd Redevelopment Project												\$	-			
	16 Sherman Street - Victoria Park Lighting												\$	-			
	4-8 Guy Place - Guy Place Park												\$	-			
32	180 Jones Street - Affordable Housing												\$	-			
	266 4th Street - Affordable Housing								ļ				\$	-			
34	2685 Ocean Ave EV Charging Station												\$	-			
35	5 Lenox Way - West Portal Elementary School		_	0,000					ļ				\$	150,000			
	350 Amber Drive - Police Academy			5,000					ļ				\$	75,000			
	4235 19th Street - Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy			0,000									\$	150,000			
38	1271 Treat Avenue - Garfield Pool		\$ 250	0,000									\$	250,000			

Attachment C: Cost Impacts

		Additional Costs to Project								Other Impacts to SF					
	Project Location	Redesign Costs	Lo N	rimary or ow-side fletering uipment Costs	Additonal Construction Costs	Pr PG	dditional Costs to oject for &E retail service	Co	Additional nst./Project Igmt Costs ue to Delay	dditional taff Time Costs	Pr	al Additional oject Costs C+D+E+F+G)	re	ost gross venue to SFPUC	CO2 Emissions (lbs) from PG&E retail service
39	1419 Bryant Street - Animal Care & Control	\$ 23,000	\$	353,000	\$ 150,000						\$	526,000			
40	1950 Mission Street - Affordable Housing	\$ 45,000	\$	150,000		\$	81,000	\$	390,000		\$	666,000	\$	294,000	623,000
41	490 South Van Ness Avenue - Affordable Housing	\$ 15,000	\$	150,000		\$	43,000	\$	273,000		\$	481,000	\$	145,000	1,034,000
42	2060 Folsom Street - Affordable Housing	\$ 2,000	\$	150,000		\$	8,000				\$	160,000	\$	581,000	922,000
43	681 Florida Street - Affordable Housing		\$	150,000		\$	166,000				\$	316,000	\$	657,000	180,000
44	1990 Folsom Street - Affordable Housing	\$ 2,000	\$	150,000		\$	29,000				\$	181,000	\$	563,000	927,000
45	3001-3021 24th Street - Affordable Housing										\$	-			
46	300 Bartlett Street - Mission Branch Library										\$	-			
47	800 Amador Street - Pier 94 - Backlands	\$ 50,000	\$	500,000						\$ 50,000	\$	600,000			
48	2241 Jerrold Avenue - Ambulance Deployment Facility	\$ 100,000	\$	75,000				\$	250,000	\$ 100,000	\$	525,000	\$	110,000	
49	Illinois St. & Terry Francois - Mariposa Pump Station					\$	22,000	\$	100,000		\$	122,000	\$	588,000	554,000
50	684 23rd Street - Potrero North										\$	-			
51	638 23rd Street - Potrero South										\$	-			
52	1001 22nd Street - Bus Electrification Pilot										\$	-			
53	2 Rankin Street - Central Bayside Pump Station										\$	-			
54	1995 Evans - Traffic Controls and Forensics		\$	75,000		\$	578,000				\$	653,000			
55	750 Phelps - Southeast Plant										\$	-			
56	2401/2403 Keith Street - Southeast Health Center		\$	150,000							\$	150,000			
57	1550 Evans Ave - Southeast Community Center		\$	500,000							\$	500,000			
58	Islais Creek Bridge Rehab (3rd Street)		\$	75,000							\$	75,000			
59	1150 Phelps - Construction Trailers										\$	-			
60	480 22nd Street - Pier 70 Pump Station										\$	-			
61	1601 Griffith Street - Griffith Pump Station					\$	27,000				\$	27,000			
62	Harmonia Street - Sunnydale HOPE										\$	-			
63	1101 Connecticut Street - HOPE Potrero										\$	-			
64	603 Jamestown Avenue - Redevelopment Project										\$	-			
65	702 Phelps Street - SFMTA Substation										\$	-			
66	1800 Jerrold Avenue - Biosolids (Temp. Power)										\$	-			
67	901 Tennessee Street										\$	-			
68	1508 Bancroft Avenue - Sustainable Sreets Shop										\$	-			
69	Mission Bay Loop - Streetlights										\$	-			
	1001 Potrero Avenue - UCSF/SFGH Research & Academic Building										Ś	_			
	Construction and Permanent Power										_				
	1920 Evans - Arborist Trailer/BUF Yard										\$	-			
	4840 Mission Street - Affordable Housing										\$	-			
	35-45 Onondaga Avenue - Health Clinic		<u> </u>								\$	-			
	241 Oneida Avenue - Denman Middle School		\$	75,000							\$	75,000			
75	2340 San Jose Avenue - Affordable Housing										\$	-			
	Multiple Locations - Guy Wires (Franchise Issue)										\$	-			
77	Multiple Service Transfers										\$	-			

Attachment C: Cost Impacts

				Other Impacts to SF						
	Project Location	Redesign Costs	Primary or Low-side Metering Equipment Costs	Additonal Construction Costs	Additional Costs to Project for PG&E retail service	Additional Const./Project Mgmt Costs Due to Delay	Staff Time	Total Additional Project Costs (B+C+D+E+F+G)	revenue to	CO2 Emissions (lbs) from PG&E retail service
78	10501 Warnerville Road - Substation Rehabilitation Project							\$ -		
	TOTAL	\$ 299,000	\$ 4,903,000	\$ 3,475,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 2,011,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 12,184,000	\$ 5,294,000	8,258,000

Total Additional Project Costs	\$ 12,184,000.00
Total Lost Gross Revenue to SFPUC	\$ 5,294,000.00
Total Cost Impact to SF (Project Costs + Lost Revenue)	\$ 17,478,000.00
Total CO2 Emissions (lbs.)	8,258,000

Note: These represent estimates of the costs that the City is aware of at at the moment. The projects may incur additional costs going forward.

The projects in RED are projects that are currently at a standstill and will face financial impacts that are TBD depending on how long they will be delayed and how they will move forward.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: RPD Annual Park Hours Report

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:54:00 PM

Attachments: Please DocuSign Park Hours Report FY19-20.do.pdf

From: Bishop, Lamonte' (REC) lamonte.bishop@sfgov.org

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 10:14 AM

To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: RPD Annual Park Hours Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please find attached our submission of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's annual Park Hours Report for FY19-20.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards, LaMonte' Bishop Manager Policy and Government Affairs San Francisco Recreation and Park Department



London N. Breed, Mayor Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager From:

Date: August 30, 2020

Park Hours Report Pursuant to Park Code Section 3.21(f) Re:

In accordance with Park Code Section 3.21 HOURS OF OPERATION, subsection (f), we submit this report to the Board of Supervisors. Park Code section 3.21 (f) provides as follows:

The Department shall issue an annual report to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor by September 1 of each year providing the following information for the preceding fiscal year: (1) the number of citations issued by the Police Department and Park Patrol for violations of this section and the age and race of individuals cited, (2) the Department's costs for repairs and maintenance, including graffiti abatement, resulting from vandalism in parks, and (3) the Department's costs associated with enforcing this section.

Background

With some exceptions, park hours are from 5:00 a.m. to midnight daily. Park Code Section 3.21 became effective 12/27/2013. Following approximately four months of public outreach and education, as well as the installation of new signage with posted hours, the Park Ranger unit began issuing citations in April 2014.

Please note the data below reflects only those citations issued by the Recreation and Park Department's (RPD) Park Rangers. While the San Francisco Police Department is able to issue citations for violations of the Park Code, the Recreation and Park Department does not track these citations and are therefore not able to report any SFPD data.

Citations Issued by SFRPD Park Rangers Under Park Code Section 3.21 in FY 19-20 and Associated Estimated Costs of Enforcement

For FY19-20 Park Rangers issued 1066 citations for violations of Park Code Section 3.21. Fortyfive percent of the people cited identifed as white, 17% Hispanic, 12% Black, 10% Asian, 13% other and 3% identity unknown.

Of the 1066 citations issued 36% were issued to people aged 18-29. Twenty-one percent were issued to people in the 30--39 age cohort while 16% were between the ages of 40-49. Eleven

McLaren Lodge in Golden Gate Park | 501 Stanyan Street | San Francisco, CA 94117 | PHONE: (415) 831-2700 | WEB: sfrecpark.org

percent of those cited were 40-59, 3% were 60-69 and 1% were 70+ and 12% did not have ages recorded.

Park Ranger staffing during the period when parks are closed from midnight to 5:00am varies by day of week, season, and depends on available staff. SFRPD typically has 8 rangers on duty for the midnight shift, and those rangers enforce *all* Park Codes, not just operating hours. As such, there is no way to determine the cost of enforcing this single code section. The Park Ranger unit operates 24/7, so park hours are enforced only 5 out of 24 hours, or 20.8% of all park patrol time. The FY19-20 actual expenditure per PeopleSoft for the Park Ranger unit was \$7,984,848 million. Approximately twenty-one percent or \$1,676,818 million might be estimated to fund *all* Park Ranger activities between midnight and 5:00am.

Incidents of Vandalism in City Parks and Associated Costs for Repairs

Vandalism reports are reported through RPD's work order management system, called TMA. In FY19-20 SFRPD processed work orders at a cost of \$564,269.23.

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Samantha Murray, Vice President
Del Mar
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Jamul

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Celebrating 150 Years of Wildlife Heritage and Conservation!

Melissa Miller-Henson Executive Director P.O. Box 944209 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090 (916) 653-4899 fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov



September 3, 2020

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you, with a Notice of Findings regarding the petition to list the Pacific leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. This notice will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on September 4, 2020.

Sincerely,

Jenn Greaves Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION NOTICE OF FINDINGS

Pacific Leatherback Sea Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), at its August 19-20, 2020 meeting, accepted for consideration the petition submitted to list the Pacific leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

Pursuant to subdivision (e)(2) of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission determined that the amount of information contained in the petition, when considered in light of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (Department) written evaluation report, the comments received, and the remainder of the administrative record, would lead a reasonable person to conclude there is a substantial possibility the requested listing could occur.

Based on that finding and the acceptance of the petition, the Commission is also providing notice that the Pacific leatherback sea turtle is a candidate species as defined by Section 2068 of the Fish and Game Code.

Within one year of the date of publication of this notice of findings, the Department shall submit a written report, pursuant to Section 2074.6 of the Fish and Game Code, indicating whether the petitioned action is warranted. Copies of the petition, as well as minutes of the August 19-20, 2020 Commission meeting, are on file and available for public review from Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, California Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320, Sacramento, California 95814, phone (916) 653-4899.

Written comments or data related to the petitioned action should be directed to the Department contact via email (<u>Travis.Buck@wildlife.ca.gov</u>): include "Pacific Leatherback Sea Turtle in the subject line. Comments may also be submitted by mail to California Department of Fish and Wildlife, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090, Attn: Travis Buck. Submission of information via email is preferred.

September 2, 2020

Fish and Game Commission

Melissa Miller-Henson Executive Director

Commissioners Eric Sklar, President Saint Helena Samantha Murray, Vice President Del Mar Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member McKinleyville Russell E. Burns, Member Napa Peter S. Silva, Member Jamul

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Celebrating 150 Years of Wildlife Heritage and Conservation!

August 24, 2020

Melissa Miller-Henson **Executive Director** P.O. Box 944209 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090 (916) 653-4899 fqc@fqc.ca.qov

www.fgc.ca.gov

NOTICE OF PROPOSAL FOR A 90 DAY EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY ACTION

Emergency Purple Sea Urchin Reference OAL File # 2020-0309-02E

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 11346.1(a)(1), the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regard to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS

Government Code Section 11346.1(a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency action to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a Notice of the Proposed Emergency Action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submission of the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in Government Code Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding "2020 Recreation Purple Sea Urchin Emergency Extension" addressed to:

Mailing Address:

Reference Attorney

Office of Administrative Law

300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250

Sacramento, CA 95814

California Fish and Game Commission

Attn: David Thesell

1416 Ninth Street, Rm. 1320 Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail Address:

Fax No.:

staff@oal.ca.gov

916-323-6826

fgc@fgc.ca.gov

For the status of the Commission's submittal to OAL for review, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at http://www.oal.ca.gov under the heading "Emergency Regulations."

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION STATEMENT OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY REGULATORY ACTION FOR READOPTION OF EMERGENCY REGULATIONS

Readoption of Section 29.06
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Purple Sea Urchin

Date of Statement: July 20, 2020

I. Emergency Regulation in Effect to Date

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) approved an emergency rulemaking, Section 29.06, that became effective on March 17, 2020. The emergency addresses concerns over the impact of purple sea urchin (PSU) overpopulation along the Northern California coast. The rule allowed recreational divers to take an unlimited number of PSU within Caspar Cove, Mendocino County.

The rule was adopted to allow recreational divers to participate in an effort supported by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) and Ocean Protection Council (OPC) to test the effect of controlling overpopulated sea urchins through anthropogenic influence. Studies have suggested that for such projects to work, intense and sustained take, mirroring that of natural predators, might be necessary. The Department has since been working with recreational divers and other partners to evaluate PSU population control in Caspar Cove.

II. Request for Approval of Readoption of Emergency Regulations

The current emergency rule, Section 29.06, will expire on September 15, 2020 unless it is readopted for an additional 90 days.

Since its adoption in March, Department staff has been working closely with recreational and commercial divers to remove PSUs in Caspar Cove. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has made public participation in these efforts and studying the effects much more difficult. Department staff is currently in the process of developing a regular rulemaking that will abolish recreational daily bag limit for PSU in Caspar Cove. In order to develop the necessary information to inform that rulemaking, the ongoing study at Caspar Cove must continue, and the current emergency rule would have to be extended.

III. Statement of Facts Constituting the Need for Readoption of the Emergency Regulatory Action

Since 2014, bull kelp (*N. luetkeana*) in Northern California has declined by more than 90%. This decline has been linked to a combination of severe warm water events and multiple ecological stressors, particularly an explosive increase in

PSU populations exacerbated by the loss of predatory sea stars due to sea star wasting disease. PSU are a native species in California; however, the species' abundance is now at a 60-fold increase compared to historic levels. This has led to the suppression of bull kelp forests on the North Coast, and a regime shift from bull kelp forests to urchin barrens across most of the region. The collapse of the kelp has had cascading effects resulting in significant losses of kelp forest ecosystem services, as well as the collapse of the North Coast commercial red urchin fishery in 2015 and the closure of the recreational red abalone fishery in 2018.

The environmental conditions in Northern California have continued to deteriorate. By 2019, divers from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) have observed very few remaining patches of bull kelp in Northern California, a condition corroborated by local divers, research entities such as Reef Check California, and the latest kelp coverage data (Figure 1). These stands tend to occupy the top of isolated, frequently disturbed boulders and rock formations that are more difficult for PSU to reach. However, Department staff are extremely concerned that the expanding PSU population may soon reach these remaining stands. As annual plants, bull kelp requires a large standing spore stock to persist successfully, and the preservation of the remaining stands is critically important.




Figure 1. Mean Bull Kelp Coverage in Northern California in km² before Marine Heat Wave (MHW), after MHW, and in 2019 (Source: McPherson, Finger, Housekeeper, Bell, Carr, Rogers-Bennett, & Kudela 2020).

Prior Commission Actions

In December 2017, the Commission closed the red abalone fishery for the 2018 season. Since then, the poor condition of the kelp forests has persisted. In August 2018, Commission and stakeholders agreed to potentially extend the closure by another two years. Recovery of the abalone fishery will not be possible without the recovery of the bull kelp forests and the return of sufficient food to support abalone survival and reproduction.

Also, in December 2017, the Commission considered alternatives to increasing or removing the take restrictions on the recreational PSU harvest, with the goal of supporting possible restoration of naturally occurring kelp along the environmentally impacted areas. In April 2018, the Commission adopted the emergency rule to significantly increase take of PSU and the emergency regulation went into effect on May 10, 2018. In February 2019, the increased take limit was adopted through regular rulemaking by the Commission.

In February 2020, the Commission adopted an emergency rule allowing unlimited take of PSU by hand or hand-held tools inside Caspar Cove, Mendocino County to help Department staff scope the feasibility of population control in a new study.

Existence of an Emergency and Need for Immediate Action

The Commission considered the following factors in determining whether an emergency exists: The magnitude of potential harm; the existence of a crisis situation; the immediacy of the need; and whether the anticipation of harm has a basis firmer than simple speculation. All available information shows that the ecological conditions in Northern California continues to be poor; the PSU overpopulation is still severe. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly constrained the recreational diver community's participation in the Caspar Cove urchin control experiment and work to date is inadequate to assess the effectiveness of this method to help protect and restore kelp. If the urchin control study in Caspar Cove is to stop because the current emergency rule expires, little useful information will have been generated by this effort and high PSU abundance will continued to suppress kelp growth in the cove.

Proposed Action by the Commission

The Commission proposes the readoption of Section 29.06 that is the same as previously adopted.

IV. Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.
- (b) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (c) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (d) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (e) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

V. Readoption Criteria

1) Same as or Substantially Equivalent

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.1(h), the text of a readopted "emergency regulation that is the same as or substantially equivalent to an emergency regulation previously adopted by that agency." The language proposed for this rulemaking is the same as the language of the original emergency regulation.

2) Substantial Progress

Government Code Section 11346.1(h) specifies "Readoption shall be permitted only if the agency has made substantial progress and proceeded with diligence to comply with subdivision (e)" [Sections 11346.2 through 11347.3, inclusive].

A rulemaking in compliance with these sections is currently ongoing and scheduled for public notice towards the end of 2020.

VI. Authority and Reference

The Commission proposes this emergency action pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 205, and 399 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret, or make more specific sections 200, 205, and 399 of said code.

VII. Section 399 Finding

Pursuant to Section 399 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission finds that the adoption of this regulation is necessary for the immediate conservation, preservation, or protection of birds, mammals, reptiles, or fish.

Emergency Regulatory Language

Section 29.06, Title 14, CCR, is amended as follows:

§ 29.06. Purple Sea Urchin

- (a) Except as provided in this section, the daily bag limit for purple sea urchin is 35 individuals.
- (b) The daily bag limit for purple sea urchin is forty (40) gallons when taken while skin or SCUBA diving in ocean waters of the following counties: Humboldt, Mendocino, and Sonoma.
- (c) There is no possession limit for purple sea urchin.
- (d) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this Section, there is no bag limit for the take of purple sea urchins in Caspar Cove, Mendocino County in the area east of a straight line drawn between 39° 22.045 ′ N. lat. 123° 49.462 ′ W. long. and 39° 21.695 ′ N. lat. 123° 49.423 ′ W. long. for the purpose of restoring kelp. The purple sea urchin may only be taken by hand or with manually operated hand-held tools.

Authority cited: Sections 200, and 205, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, and 205, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Informative Digest

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) adopted Section 29.06, Purple Sea Urchin, as an emergency rulemaking abolishing daily bag limit for Purple Sea Urchin (PSU) taken by hand or hand-held tools inside Caspar Cove, Mendocino County, effective on March 17, 2020.

The emergency rule is due to expire on September 14, 2020 if a readoption is not filed. A readoption is necessary to ensure that the Department can continue to collect the data it needs to obtain necessary information on a controlled study supported by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) and the California Ocean Protection Council on the efficacy of PSU population control. Commission and Department staff are currently developing a regular rulemaking package that would remove the daily recreational bag limit for PSU in Caspar Cove. However, the development of that proposal is dependent on the data currently being collected from Caspar Cove, which will occur only if the emergency rule is readopted.

Proposed Regulatory Action:

The regulation temporarily abolishes the daily bag limit for PSUs inside Caspar Cove.

Benefits of the Regulation to the State's Environment:

The Commission anticipates benefits to the State's environment by the sustainable management of California's ocean resources. The increased take for the recreational purple sea urchin harvest, with the goal of supporting restoration of naturally occurring kelp inside Caspar Cove, is critical to the recovery of Northern California's kelp forest ecosystem.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing State Regulations:

The Legislature has delegated authority to the Commission to promulgate sport fishing regulations (Fish and Game Code, sections 200 and 205) as well as authority to promulgate corresponding emergency regulations as necessary (Fish and Game Code, Section 399). No other state agency has the authority to promulgate such regulations. The Commission has conducted a search of Title 14, California Code or Regulations (CCR) and determined that the proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations, and that the proposed regulation is consistent with other sport fishing regulations and marine protected area regulations in Title 14, CCR.




DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer 1725 23rd Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95816-7100 Telephone: (916) 445-7000 FAX: (916) 445-7053 calshpo.ohp@parks.ca.gov

www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

Armando Quintero, Director



September 2, 2020

San Francisco County Board of Supervisors Clerk of the Board City Hall. Room 244 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, California 94102

RE: National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Mission Cultural Center (Latinos in **Twentieth Century California MPS)**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60.6(c) I am notifying you that the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) at its next meeting intends to consider and take action on the nomination of the abovenamed property to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Details on that meeting are on the enclosed notice. The National Register is the federal government's official list of historic buildings and other cultural resources worthy of preservation. Listing in the National Register provides recognition and assists in preserving California's cultural heritage. If the item is removed from the scheduled agenda, you will be notified by mail.

Local government comments regarding the National Register eligibility of this property are welcomed. Letters should be sent to California State Parks, Attn: Office of Historic Preservation, Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer, 1725 23rd Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, California 95816. So that the SHRC will have adequate time to consider them, it is requested, but not required, that written comments be received by the Office of Historic Preservation fifteen (15) days before the SHRC meeting. Interested parties are encouraged to attend the SHRC meeting and present oral testimony.

As of January 1, 1993, all National Register properties are automatically included in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and afforded consideration in accordance with state and local environmental review procedures.

The federal requirements covering the National Register program are to be found in the National Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and in Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60. State law regarding the California Register is in the Public Resources Code, Section 5024. Should you have questions regarding this nomination, or would like a copy of the nomination, please contact the Registration Unit at (916) 445-7009. Note that staff revises nominations throughout the nomination process.

Sincerely,

Julianne Polanco

State Historic Preservation Officer

Enclosure: Meeting Notice



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION STATE HISTORICAL RESOURCES COMMISSION

Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
Telephone: (916) 445-7000 FAX: (916) 445-7053
calshpo.ohp@parks.ca.gov www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

Armando Quintero, Director

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Adam Sriro, Chair Lee Adams III Bryan K. Brandes Janet Hansen Alan Hess Luis Hoyos Marshall McKay René Vellanoweth, PhD

MEETING NOTICE

Pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20, board members/commissioners of a state body may participate in public meetings remotely. The public may observe, provide public comment during the public comment periods, and otherwise observe remotely in accordance with Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

FOR:

State Historical Resources Commission Quarterly Meeting

DATE:

Friday, November 6, 2020

TIME:

9:00 A.M.

PLACE:

This will be a Virtual Meeting through one or more remote meeting platforms such as Zoom and/or Microsoft Teams. Dial-in access will also be available. Information on how to log in or phone in to this meeting, including web address and passcodes, will be posted no later

than October 23, 2020 at http://ohp.parks.ca.gov.

If you are in need of special accommodations pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, please call Twila Willis-Hunter at (916) 445-7052. Questions regarding the meeting should be directed to the Registration Unit (916) 445-7008. In accordance with the *Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act* an agenda for this meeting will be published on the Office of Historic Preservation website no later than October 23, 2020.

From: Senna Lee

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Cityattorney; District Attorney, (DAT); SFSO Complaints (SHF); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Raju, Manohar (PDR); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu;

RachelNorton@sfusd.edu

Subject: DEFUND12

Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 9:23:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Senna Lee, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Senna Lee

320 29th Avenue 94121

sennajlee@gmail.com

4159408154

From: Allison

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

Subject: Request for Budget Support: SFFD and NERT Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 1:40:29 PM

Attachments: Letter to Mayor Breed - Request for Budget Support.docx

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

August 26, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront these challenges, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to

ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Allison Rudd 851 30th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong San Francisco Board of Supervisors District 1 Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer Allison Rudd 851 30th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

August 26, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront these challenges, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with

numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Allison Rudd

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

San Francisco District 1 Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer

Email: Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org

From: Sanli Vasquez, Solen

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Cityattorney; District Attorney, (DAT); SFSO Complaints (SHF); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Raju, Manohar (PDR); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu;

RachelNorton@sfusd.edu

Subject: redirecting SFPD funds to improving social problems

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 1:44:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Solen Sanli Vasquez, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards EDUCATION (which is supposed to be the greatest equalizer), homelessness, universal mental health care, addiction prevention and substance abuse treatment, housing equality and the like.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Solen Sanli Vasquez, Ph.D. Sociology Instructor Santa Rosa Junior College

2419 47th Ave. San Francisco CA 94116 solensanli@gmail.com

From: George W. Dowdall

To: <u>Board of Supervisors, (BOS)</u>

Subject: SFFD NERT Budget

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:06:05 PM

Attachments: SFFD NERT Budget.msg

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

George W. Dowdall, Ph.D.

239 Brannan Street, Apt. 16G San Francisco, CA 94107

August 26, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: <u>Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org</u>

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group)
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

District Supervisor Matt Haney Email: Matt Haney@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same

time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

George W. Dowdall

From: <u>Conor Broderick</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Cityattorney; District Attorney, (DAT); SFSO Complaints (SHF); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Raju, Manohar (PDR); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu;

RachelNorton@sfusd.edu

Subject: Defund the Police.

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:06:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Conor Broderick, and I grew up in Northern California and plan to move back to the Bay Area next year. This past week, in the wake of the murder of Jacob Blake our nation has yet again been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. San Francisco and the Bay Area city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Conor Broderick

From: <u>Kimberly Thai</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)

Subject: Please support NERT

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:12:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Kimberly Thai kimberlyreneethai@gmail.com
666 Hampshire Street, SF, CA, 94110

August 26, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Budget Director Kelly Kirkpatrick
Email: Kelly.Kirkpatrick@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: <u>Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org</u>

Shamann Walton, District 10 supervisor waltonstaff@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members

of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted, Kimberly Thai From: <u>Niki Rivers</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS)

Subject: NERT Funding

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 2:59:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Niki Rivers

4736 17th Street

SF, CA 94117

August 27, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group)
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dean.Preston@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident, taxpayer and NERT volunteer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also to respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Niki Rivers

From: Morten

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of

Supervisors, (BOS)

Cc: <u>Arteseros, Erica (FIR)</u>; <u>Dick Morten</u>

Subject: Support for NERT funding and AWSS expansion to vulnerable neighborhoods

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 3:01:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Dick Morten

msarawak@yahoo.com

August 27, 2020

Mayor London Breed

City Hall, Room 200

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Budget & Appropriations Committee Linda Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Gordon Mar

Dear Mayor Breed,

I and my family, Madeline and Ai Lin Morten, have been NERTs from the earliest courses following Loma Prieta. We support preparing ourselves and our community for the inevitable disaster following a major earthquake and fire.

Over the decades, we have maintained our NERT training through re-

certification courses and twice a year drills. We have organized two NERT sessions for Sunset at Holy Name Church, where over 150 NERTs were certified (the pandemic disrupted planning for a third session and Stop the Bleed training). Ai Lin and I were fortunate to attend the Treasure Island fire school Advanced NERT Training (which unfortunately has been discontinued). I chaired the SPUR Disaster Preparedness Task Force which was highly supportive of expanding NERT training.

I have been a Red Cross Disaster Action Team volunteer responding to numerous San Francisco incidents and national assignments such as Katrina/Rita (hard to believe it was 15 years ago) and wildfires in Northern California and San Diego.

I am strong advocate of an independent, standalone Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) powered by an unlimited supply of saltwater rather than potable (drinking) water as proposed by the SFPUC. The Civil Grand Jury report notes the west, south and southeast neighborhoods are vulnerable to fire following an earthquake because they do not have AWSS. A conflagration is awaiting these neighborhoods unless we expeditiously expand AWSS citywide availing ourselves of unlimited seawater pumped from the Bay and Pacific. The northeast quadrant of San Francisco has AWSS why can't the other neighborhoods have a equal system?

We remained very concerned that our firefighters and other first responders will be overwhelmed when the major disaster strikes. One only needs to look how resources are stretched for major fires such as Fisherman's Wharf and South of Market (which incidentally used AWSS). In event of a major earthquake we cannot depend up mutual aid to bail us out. We will be on our own.

NERT, a pool of trained volunteers, at the neighborhood level will be a critical resource to reduce injuries, deaths and damages, and support the City as it tries to restore itself. We are concerned that NERT teams lack essential equipment and supplies to carry out the mission they have been trained for. Berkeley has a team based equipment and supply program for their CERTs. Even in difficult fiscal times San Francisco should have a similar program.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary to ensure that they cannot fulfill their critical lifesaving missions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Morten

Sunset District

From: <u>Cathy Spensley</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

Subject: Supporting NERT

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 4:22:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing

community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Spensley

From: <u>Jon Wurfl</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Preston, Dean (BOS); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Budget Request for SFFD and SFFD NERT Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 4:46:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Jon Würfl, 1040 Cole St., SF, CA 415.659.8738

August 27, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Budget Director Kelly Kirkpatrick

Email: Kelly.Kirkpatrick@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: <u>Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org</u>

Supervisor Dean Preston

Email: Dean.Preston@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily

declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Würfl

Cole Valley / Parnassus Height NERT Coordinator 415.659.8738 KM6GVN From: Nathan Garcia

Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS) To:

SFFD/NERT Funding Subject:

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 8:57:35 PM

Attachments: 2020.0827 - Breed.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted

Please see the attached.

Nathan Garcia 1486 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94115 Garcia.Nathan@gmail.com

August 27, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston

Email: prestonstaff@sfgov.org

Re: SFFD/NERT Funding

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same

Mayor Breed August 27, 2020 Page 2 of 2

time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Nathan Garcia

From: <u>Patricia Martell</u>

To: <u>Breed, Mayor London (MYR)</u>

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)

Subject: Asking for NERT support

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 9:27:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

August 26, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed

City Hall, Room 200

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: <u>Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org</u>

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group)

Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee

Email: Norman.Yee@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Martell

NERT volunteer since 2011

pkimson@yahoo.com

From: Lou Ann Bassan

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS);

Mar, Gordon (BOS); Marstaff (BOS)

Subject: SFFD / NERT Funding

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 8:54:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Lou Ann Bassan Larry Klingenberg 3338 Noriega Street San Francisco, CA 94122

August 28, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4

Email: Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, marstaff@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program, on behalf of myself and my husband. We are both trained certified NERT volunteers.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing

levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Lou Ann Bassan Larry Klingenberg From: PIERRE HURTER

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)

Subject: SFFD and NERT

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 10:06:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Gerda Hurter 515 Diamond Street San Francisco. CA 94114

August 27, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: <u>Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org</u>

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group)
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident, voter and taxpayer for over 30 years, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and specifically the San Francisco NERT program.

My husband and I became involved with NERT shortly after the Loma Prieta earthquake. Then as now, we found ourselves in difficult and, in many ways, unprecedented times. As we continue to confront a pandemic that shows no signs of disappearing soon, our first responders must be able to handle not only our current challenges but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of other major disasters.

The Fire Department is being tasked with increasing calls that involve assisting our most vulnerable neighbors, aside from providing mutual assistance in other counties,

the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond any reasonably anticipated expectations.

My husband and I, as NERT members (California Disaster Corp) have volunteered outside of the City during the Camp Fire and assisted at COVID-19 testing centers and food distribution. On Monday, I helped distribute food to hundreds of people at the Portola walk-in pop-up.

NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. We provide a robust, efficient and cost-effective auxiliary to the SFFD and frees sworn members of the SFFD to do what they have been trained and tasked to do.

I urge you to fully support SFFD and NERT with the funding and support necessary to ensure that our City and its residents continue to be safe during these challenging times

A resident, homeowner and voter of San Francisco

Gerda Hurter

From: <u>Maureen Conefrey</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)

Subject: NERT Funding

 Date:
 Friday, August 28, 2020 10:45:07 AM

 Attachments:
 Mayor Breed - NERT Budget Letter.rev1.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please see the attached letter. Thanks.

Maureen Conefrey

(415) 260-1904

Merced Manor Neighborhood

NERT Volunteer

August 27, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger

Email: Ashley.Groffenberger@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Norman Yee – District 7 Norman.Yee@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our

vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Conefrey

From: Meighan, Stuart

To: <u>Breed, Mayor London (MYR)</u>

Cc: Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]

Subject: SFFD and NERT First Responders Budget Priority

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 10:59:22 AM

Attachments: SFFD and NERT First Responders Budget Priority.docx

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Honorable Mayor, Supervisors, and Staff;

Please accept the attached letter as my expression of support to fund first responders despite the budget shortfall.

Failing to do so would be penny-wise and pound foolish.

S. Spence Meighan Cell: 510 915-5166

Stuart.meighan@ucsf.edu

Stuart Meighan (510) 915-5166 317 Chenery Street San Francisco, California

August 28, 2020

Honorable Mayor London Breed City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

Cc: Mayor's Budget Director Kelly Kirkpatrick

Email: Kelly.Kirkpatrick@sfgov.org

Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong

Email: Linda.Wong@sfgov.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (group) Email: <u>Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org</u>

Rafael Mandelman

Email: mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same

time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart Meighan

317 Chenery Street, San Francisco, California 510 915 5166

From: Sam Judge

To: <u>Board of Supervisors, (BOS)</u>

Subject: Shame

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 1:28:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am not surprised. I am not surprised by the budget you passed. There are things in the budget I am happy about and I thank you for. I realize you have a thankless difficult job. A job that I do not envy. But you have also failed massively to grasp the moment our city and our country is in. Your inability to shrink the police budget by any reasonable amount is pathetic. Your claims to wanting a more just system that protects the cities most vulnerable are empty words if you do not take actions to actually fix the system. The that part really confuses me is that you talk the talk you say you want to end homelessness that you want to improve SF school system that you want to make housing more affordable but you don't walk the walk. You can see with your own eyes the ways the system is broken and I know you have heard the community telling you the violence and brutality that SFPD and SF Sheriff use on our street. What you don't seem capable of doing is acting in a timely manor or listening to your constituents. I'm mad and disappointed. I hope you know that to a degree the police violence against San Franciscans that occurs during this budget is partially on your hands I hope you know that and hold that thought.

Abolish SFPD,

Sam

District 1 Resident and voter

From: Roger W

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Subject: Please support NERT

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 2:17:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Roger Weinman North Beach, 94133 August 26, 2020

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Weinman

From: Christine Huynh

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Cityattorney; District Attorney, (DAT); SFSO Complaints (SHF); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Raju, Manohar (PDR); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu;

RachelNorton@sfusd.edu

Subject: Defund the Police

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 8:31:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Christine, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Christine Huynh 909-900-6476

From: Norman Ten

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: SFO - Corazon Gilbert. MSG to SF Supervisor Date: Saturday, August 29, 2020 12:29:54 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

From: "Gilbert, Corazon (POL)" < corazon.gilbert2@sfgov.org>

Date: August 28, 2020 at 7:29:51 PM PDT

To: "Norman.Ten@seiu1021.org" < Norman.Ten@seiu1021.org>

Subject: PSA mail to SF Supervisor

Dear Supervisor:

San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next.

The budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the workers like us at SFO risking our lives every day to provide a safe and secure airport for the traveling public. SFO is the first stop for many visitors to our great city and we the members of SEIU 1021 are the workers ensuring a safe and secure airport.

There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure:

- 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds.
- 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out.
- 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services.

The City workers at SFO, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises.

SFO and San Francisco are reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco, the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers at SFO who serve our residents and our airport each day in the face of a dangerous pandemic.

#SEIU1021 #SFOSTRONG

Respectfully,

Corazon Q, Gilbert PSA #4591

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Norman Ten

To: <u>Board of Supervisors, (BOS)</u>
Subject: SFO: Phillip Lee City Budget

Date: Saturday, August 29, 2020 12:51:11 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

From: Philip Lee < phil.lee406@gmail.com>

Date: August 28, 2020 at 5:19:20 PM PDT

To: "norman.ten@seiu1021.org" <norman.ten@seiu1021.org>

Subject: Budget

Dear Supervisor:

San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next.

The budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the workers like us at SFO risking our lives every day to provide a safe and secure airport for the traveling public. SFO is the first stop for many visitors to our great city and we the members of SEIU 1021 are the workers ensuring a safe and secure airport.

There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure:

- 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds.
- 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out.
- 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services.

The City workers at SFO, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises.

SFO and San Francisco are reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco, the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers at SFO who serve our residents and our airport each day in the face of a dangerous pandemic.

#SEIU1021 #SFOSTRONG

Respectfully, Philip Lee From: Pamela Katz

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: DEFEND THE POLICE

Date: Saturday, August 29, 2020 10:02:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is [NAME] and I live [OR WORK] in San Francisco.

I am writing to demand public safety for all.

We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

Let me reiterate -- we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE. Those who tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter. That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.

Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

Worse than that, police harm our communities.

When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.

This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.
- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.
- In 2019, SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of **2.4 times PER DAY.** Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.

- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.

Policing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.

Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified **at least \$295 million** in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, revinest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

Chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light.

Chaos is spending \$23 million a year on police units that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Thank you for your time,

[YOUR NAME]

 $[YOUR\ ADDRESS-\ work\ or\ home\ if\ possible,\ apparently\ Supervisors\ will\ ignore/filter\ emails\ without\ it]$

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER- optional]

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Allegra Mautner</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary

Subject: Fund our First Responders! Defund the POLICE!

Date: Sunday, August 30, 2020 12:50:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront the same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.


Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive

adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

See you out there on the frontlines, Allegra Mautner Cell: (858)361-6606 ISA Certified Arborist WE-10369A



From: <u>John Simpson</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Continue to support NERT

Date: Sunday, August 30, 2020 3:06:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a resident, taxpayer and a member of Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) I ask that the City continues to support NERT.

Since NERT was created 30 years ago over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events and in the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens.

I urge you to fully support NERT.

Respectfully

John Simpson 626 20th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94121

CC:

Acting Budget Director Ashley Groffenberger Budget & Appropriations Committee Member Linda Wong Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer From: <u>Monique Flambures</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject:Make some real cuts to SFPD -Date:Sunday, August 30, 2020 6:09:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Monique Flambures and I live in District 5 in San Francisco.

I am writing to demand public safety for all.

We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

Let me reiterate -- we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE. Those who tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter. That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.

Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

Worse than that, police harm our communities.

When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.

This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.
- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.
- In 2019, SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of **2.4 times PER DAY**. Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.
- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.

Policing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.

Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified **at least \$295 million** in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, revinest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

Chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light.

Chaos is spending \$23 million a year on police units that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Thank you for your time,

Monique Flambures- 31 Page St. #401 San Francisco CA 94102

415-214-5604

From: Charles Rathbone

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS);

Haney, Matt (BOS)

Subject: Support NERT funding in the Fire Department budget

Date: Sunday, August 30, 2020 7:25:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

I'm one of 30,000 volunteers who have completed training as a NERT (Neighborhood Emergency Response Team.)

NERT training gives me skills and the confidence that I can be useful in a major earthquake or other disaster.

Please ensure that NERT training (and re-training) get adequate funding in the budget.

--

Charles Rathbone 330 Berry Street #206 San Francisco, CA 941158

Email: charles.rathbone@sonic.net

Tel: 415-500-2431

From: TJ Firpo

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR): Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: Police budgeting

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 11:32:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Thomas Firpo and I live in San Francisco.

I am writing to demand public safety for all.

We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

Let me reiterate -- we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE. Those who tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter. That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.

Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

Worse than that, police harm our communities.

When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.

This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.
- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.
- In 2019, SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of **2.4 times PER DAY.** Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.

- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.

Policing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.

Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified **at least \$295 million** in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, revinest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

Chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light.

Chaos is spending \$23 million a year on police units that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Thank you for your time,

[YOUR NAME]

 $[YOUR\ ADDRESS-\ work\ or\ home\ if\ possible,\ apparently\ Supervisors\ will\ ignore/filter\ emails\ without\ it]$

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER- optional]

- TJ

From: Natasha Muse

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: We are not asking for chaos.

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 12:58:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Natasha Muse and I live in San Francisco.

I am writing to demand public safety for all.

We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

Let me reiterate -- we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE. Those who tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter. That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.

Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

Worse than that, police harm our communities.

When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.

This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.
- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.
- In 2019, SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of 2.4 times PER DAY. Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.

- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.

Policing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.

Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified at least \$295 million in SFPD line-item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, reinvest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

Chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light.

Chaos is spending \$23 million a year on police units that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Thank you for your time,

Natasha Muse

31 Page St. #401 San Francisco, CA 94102 From: Sean Robinson

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); BOS-Supervisors

Subject: San Francisco needs a budget for all

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 1:01:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next.

But the budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 doesn't ensure that we'll be able to address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. It instead attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the public workers risking their lives to provide disaster services.

There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure:

- 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds.
- 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out.
- 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services.

City workers, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises. We are doing more with less each and every day as a result of over \$560 million in annualized vacant budget positions.

San Francisco is reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic, systemic racism, and an economy that favors the wealthy. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco, the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers who serve our residents each day in the face of a dangerous pandemic.

Yours	sincere	ly.
Sean F	Robinson	n

This email was sent by Sean Robinson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sean provided an email address (seanrobinson262@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sean Robinson at seanrobinson262@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834

From: **Christopher Summers** Breed, Mayor London (MYR); BOS-Supervisors To: Subject: San Francisco needs a budget for all Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 2:39:28 PM This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next. But the budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 doesn't ensure that we'll be able to address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. It instead attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the public workers risking their lives to provide disaster services. There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure: 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds. 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out. 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services. City workers, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises. We are doing more with less each and every day as a result of over \$560 million in annualized vacant budget positions. San Francisco is reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic, systemic racism, and an economy that favors the wealthy. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco,

the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers who serve our residents each day in the face

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Summers

of a dangerous pandemic.

This email was sent by Christopher Summers via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Christopher provided an email address (csummers@larkinstreetyouth.org) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christopher Summers at csummers@larkinstreetyouth.org.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834

From: Kay Walker To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); BOS-Supervisors Subject: San Francisco needs a budget for all Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:12:27 PM This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next. But the budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 doesn't ensure that we'll be able to address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. It instead attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the public workers risking their lives to provide disaster services. There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure: 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds. 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out. 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services. City workers, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises. We are doing more with less each and every day as a result of over \$560 million in annualized vacant budget positions. San Francisco is reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic, systemic racism, and an economy that favors the wealthy. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco, the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers who serve our residents each day in the face of a dangerous pandemic.

Kay Walker

Yours sincerely,

This email was sent by Kay Walker via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kay provided an email address (kayleona@att.net) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kay Walker at kayleona@att.net.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834

From: <u>Marissa Kaufmann</u>
To: <u>Marissa Kaufmann</u>

Subject: Call to defund the police in San Francisco

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 10:33:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Marissa Kaufmann, and I am a resident of San Francisco. These past few months, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Marissa Kaufmann

45 Lansing Street San Francisco, CA 94105

(303) 437-9011

mkaufmann193@gmail.com

From: Loretta Chardin

To: <u>Board of Supervisors, (BOS)</u>

Subject: Suoes raises

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 11:09:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am outraged that while so many San Franciscans are struggling, the supes are giving themselves raises!

Loretta Chardin San Francisco resident

--

"When fascism comes to America, it will be wrapped in a flag and carrying a cross" - Sinclair Lewis

From: <u>Luci Anderson</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chu, Carmen (ASR); Cityattorney; District Attorney, (DAT); SFSO Complaints (SHF); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Raju, Manohar (PDR); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu;

RachelNorton@sfusd.edu

Subject: Listen to your youth if no one else

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 7:42:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Luci Anderson, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Luci Anderson

From: Chuck Turner

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: Social programs funding

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 5:30:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Chuck Turner and I live in San Francisco.
br>
br am writing to demand public safety for all.
br> We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

simprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and Indigenous,

 Let me reiterate --

 we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE.</br/> Those who

 tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter.
That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.
b>Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

b>>br>
Worse than that, police harm our communities.

br>
 When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.
br>
br>This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.

sp>- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.

SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of 2.4 times PER DAY.
/b> Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.
dry- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.
br>
br>
br>lcing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.
br>
br>Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

br>Cbr>DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified at least \$295 million in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

br>
br>
What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, revinest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light. https://docs.precent.org/light. that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

br>

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

br>
br>
Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Str>Chuck Turner

Str>1217 Sanchez Street work or home if possible, apparently Supervisors will ignore/filter emails without it]

| YOUR PHONE NUMBER- optional From: Chuck Turner

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR): Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon

(BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: Social programs funding

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 5:30:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Chuck Turner and I live in San Francisco.
br>
br am writing to demand public safety for all.
br> We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

simprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, transport such as Black, Indigenous, and Indigenous,

 Let me reiterate --

 we demand that SFPD be defunded THIS BUDGET CYCLE.</br/> Those who

 tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter.
That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.
b>Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

b>>br>
Worse than that, police harm our communities.

br>
 When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.
br>
br>This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.

sp>- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.

SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of 2.4 times PER DAY.
/b> Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.
dry- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.
br>
br>
br>lcing can't be reformed because it's working as intended. bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.
br>
br>Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

br>Cbr>DefundSFPDNow, a Black-led campaign in San Francisco, has identified at least \$295 million in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

br>
br>
What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, revinest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light. https://docs.precent.org/light. that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

br>

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

br>
br>
Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Str>Chuck Turner

Str>1217 Sanchez Street work or home if possible, apparently Supervisors will ignore/filter emails without it]

| YOUR PHONE NUMBER- optional From: <u>Katrina Ciraldo</u>

To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Supervisors; Stefani, Catherine (BOS);

Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Haney, Matt (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Yee,

Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)

Subject:Invest in community not militarized policeDate:Thursday, September 3, 2020 6:22:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is katrina ciraldo and I live and work in San Francisco.

I am writing to demand public safety for all.

We must defund SFPD in this year's budget cycle and redirect those funds to investments which make us ALL safe, including public health, housing, reparations for communities most targeted by policing and imprisonment such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and our unhoused neighbors.

Let me reiterate -- we demand that you vote to reject any budget that does not fire 200 officers **THIS BUDGET CYCLE**. You can still do this by introducing budget amendments to the budget that came out of the Budget and Appropriations Committee.

Those who tell us to wait are telling our most marginalized communities that their lives do not matter. That brutalization, suffering, and oppression does not deserve an urgent response. That equity and justice is not a right, but a privilege.

Police don't keep us safe.

American policing began with slave patrols. Modern day policing was a response to the rise of labor unions. Today, approximately 99% of SFPD calls for service are in response to non-violent issues. Most calls are related to public health, unhoused people, traffic/parking, and noise complaints.

Worse than that, police harm our communities.

When the police talk about "public safety", they're speaking in code. The word "public" is not referring to marginalized communities. It's not referring to Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Jessica Williams, or Luis Góngora Pat. It's referring to the people the system of policing was designed for. The slave owner. The union buster. The wealthy homeowner.

This is reflected not just in the lived experiences of BIPOC, trans people, and unhoused people. It's also reflected in the numbers.

- Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city's population, but account for 40% of police searches, 54% of our jail population, and 40% of people killed by police.
- In the fourth quarter of 2019, 76% of all uses of force by SFPD were against people of color.

- In 2019, SFPD officers pointed a gun at San Franciscans an average of **2.4 times PER DAY**. Only 14 of the 868 incidents were in defense of self or others.
- After 4 years of DOJ mandated reforms, non-gun related SFPD uses of force have only decreased from 1,142 to 1,110.

Policing can't be reformed because it's working as intended.

SFPD is a violent, racist, and explicitly anti-Black institution. Cal DOJ and the SFPD's implicit bias trainer recently described the level of anti-Black bias in SFPD as "extreme." This presents a clear and imminent danger to our most marginalized communities. The first step towards public safety for all is disbanding SFPD and eliminating that danger.

Disbanding SFPD is an act of harm reduction. It is just one step on the way towards achieving public safety for all. We can't be safe until EVERYONE has access to fundamental human rights -- housing, food, education, healthcare, opportunity.

DefundSFPDNow, a multi-racial campaign in San Francisco, has identified at least \$295 million in SFPD line item budget cuts as a step towards reducing the threat to public safety and reinvesting in solutions that begin building public safety.

What can you do as my elected official? Defund SFPD, reinvest in our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety that uplifts ALL San Franciscans by

Refusing to pass any budget that does not fire 200 officers or Sheriff's deputies

Leveraging the rights of Supervisors to **amend the BUDGET** that came out of Budget and Appropriations this cycle

Ensuring that at least \$120 million of budget cuts are reinvested back into predominantly Black communities

Ensuring that the city closes all jails in the Hall of Justice building and ends the use of holding cells there for all purposes, including short term or overnight stays.

We are not asking for chaos.

Chaos is responding to someone experiencing a mental health crisis with a gun and combat training instead of care and services.

Chaos is stopping a Black driver for a broken tail light to threaten and harass them instead of offering to replace the light.

Chaos is spending \$23 million a year on police units that criminalize poverty instead of providing housing and opportunity.

We are not asking for chaos. We are asking that you be reasonable.

Defund SFPD, Defund Sheriffs, refund our communities, and reimagine the path to public safety.

Thank you for your time,

Katrina Ciraldo

618 shotwell street Sf ca 94110 From: <u>Dharmishta Rood</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Cc: Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Wong, Linda (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS)

Subject: Writing in support of NERT program and budget

Date: Monday, September 7, 2020 10:51:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a San Francisco resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express my support for the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco NERT program.

We are in the midst of unprecedented, difficult times. As our City continues to confront same, I am deeply concerned about the ability of our firefighters and other first responders to not only meet the current challenges, but also respond to the needs of our City in the event of an earthquake or other major disaster.

The Fire Department, like other City Departments, is being asked to reduce its budget this year. With an ever-increasing number of calls and incidents to which our firefighters are asked to respond, most of which now involve calls to assist the unhoused and other members of our vulnerable populations, and including mutual assistance calls to fight fires in other counties, the Fire Department has seen its resources stretched beyond levels anyone could have reasonably anticipated. These demands on the Fire Department have continued to rise, while at the same time, since 2016, the Fire Department staffing levels have steadily declined. Worse yet, our firefighters are working with aging, substandard trucks and equipment in need of replacement.

After the 1989 Loma Prieta Quake, residents of the hard-hit Marina District approached the SFFD and asked for training that would enable them to support and assist the SFFD during a disaster. The Fire Department wisely reasoned that with resources stretched thin in the event of a citywide disaster, the Department would benefit from a pool of trained volunteers. Thus, the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) was born. To-date, over 30,000 residents have been trained by the SFFD in low-risk disaster response skills which enable NERT volunteers to assist SFFD and our City.

Since its inception 30 years ago, NERT volunteers have been called upon to assist with events ranging from helping at Cooling Centers during heat waves to more recently assisting with numerous tasks during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the past several months, NERT volunteers have participated in over 1,500 instances of volunteering, spending countless hours doing community outreach and education, and assisting at food distribution and testing centers. NERT Disaster Corps volunteers have also been called up over the past few years to assist communities outside San Francisco during fires and other disasters.

Public Safety must be among our top priorities. The SFFD and NERT volunteers continue to contribute daily to the safety and welfare of our City and its citizens. The SFFD must receive adequate funding to ensure proper staffing levels and properly maintained equipment. Failure to do this is short-sighted, foolhardy, and fiscally irresponsible, placing residents' lives and

businesses at risk. This simply isn't the time to reduce SFFD's budget.

I urge you to fully support the SFFD and NERT with the increased funding necessary both to ensure that our City and its residents continue to thrive and survive during these challenging times and also to ensure a bright future for our City.

Respectfully submitted,

Dharmishta Rood

From: Valerie Tucker Richardson Breed, Mayor London (MYR); BOS-Supervisors To: Subject: San Francisco needs a budget for all Date: Monday, September 7, 2020 1:59:39 PM This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next. But the budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 doesn't ensure that we'll be able to address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. It instead attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the public workers risking their lives to provide disaster services. There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure: 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds. 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out. 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services. City workers, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises. We are doing more with less each and every day as a result of over \$560 million in annualized vacant budget positions. San Francisco is reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic, systemic racism, and an economy that favors the

wealthy. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco, the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers who serve our residents each day in the face

Yours sincerely,

Valerie Tucker Richardson

of a dangerous pandemic.

This email was sent by Valerie Tucker Richardson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Valerie Tucker provided an email address (valtuckrich@mac.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Valerie Tucker Richardson at valtuckrich@mac.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834

From: Veronica Vidrio To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); BOS-Supervisors Subject: San Francisco needs a budget for all Date: Monday, September 7, 2020 2:19:40 PM This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. San Francisco cannot praise frontline workers as essential one moment and then treat us like we are expendable in the next. But the budget submitted by the Mayor's office on July 21 doesn't ensure that we'll be able to address the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. It instead attempts to balance the budget on the backs of the public workers risking their lives to provide disaster services. There is another path forward. The City has over \$1 billion in reserves, thousands of vacancies yet to be frozen, and federal aid on the way. As the Board of Supervisors deliberates on the next budget, we urge you to consider three steps that avoids the crushing, harmful austerity that our community cannot endure: 1.) Tap into the city's rainy day and reserve funds. 2.) Curtail expensive contracting- and granting-out. 3.) Support initiatives to make sure billionaires and wealthy corporations pay their fair share to fund public services. City workers, in addition to risking our lives every day on the frontlines of COVID-19, have already given back tens of millions in scheduled raises. We are doing more with less each and every day as a result of over \$560 million in annualized vacant budget positions. San Francisco is reeling from the impacts of a global pandemic, systemic racism, and an economy that favors the wealthy. We need the Board of Supervisors to take these necessary steps to protect every resident of San Francisco,

the vital public services we all benefit from, and the dedicated workers who serve our residents each day in the face

Yours sincerely,

of a dangerous pandemic.

Veronica Vidrio

This email was sent by Veronica Vidrio via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol RFC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Veronica provided an email address (vvidrio88@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Veronica Vidrio at vvidrio88@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol RFC 3834 visit: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3834

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Employee Pay Raises

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 8:27:00 AM

----Original Message-----

From: Theresa Behdjet <theresabehdjet@me.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 6:36 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <box>

dos.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Employee Pay Raises

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

It is my understanding that you are planning pay raises for SF city employees across the board through funding from a discretionary fund reserved for emergencies. If this is true, trust me that I will do everything in my power to make sure every single one of you is voted out in the next election, just for considering it.

Theresa Behdjet

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Carla K</u>

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)

Cc: Haney, Matt (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS);

Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); SFPD.

Commission (POL); SFPD, Chief (POL)

Subject: Oppose Major SFPD Budget Cuts FY 2020-21

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 4:04:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed, President Yee, and Supervisors:

The Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association represents more than 530 members in District 7.

We oppose major cutbacks in the SFPD and Sheriff's Department budget for Fiscal Year 2020-21 as proposed by Mayor Breed and increased to \$120 Million in cuts over two years by the Board of Supervisors Budget Committee.

The precipitous, dramatic and unfocused proposed cuts will threaten public safety, while paradoxically also impeding the very reform of police practices we all recognize is necessary and overdue, by starving the Department of resources it needs for recruitment, training and supervision at this critical time.

Transferring police responsibility for dealing with social problems like mental illness, homelessness and drug abuse to other agencies better suited to respond has great merit. But taking thousands of these calls out of the hands of the SFPD cannot be done overnight. Cuts to accommodate this transfer of duties to social workers and other departments are most appropriate in the second year of this two-year budget, to allow time for careful planning, testing and evaluation of the effectiveness of new protocols, as well as hiring and training of new staff.

Specifically, we oppose canceling three of four police academy classes, at a time when it is now more urgent than ever to recruit and train new officers committed to policing reform. De-funding academy classes also jeopardizes efforts to create a more linguistically and ethnically diverse police force capable of meeting the needs of all San Franciscans.

These grave budget reductions will further destabilize a city already in turmoil due to the pandemic, where the numbers of many serious crimes are increasing. Homicides are up 33 percent this year from the previous year, while the rates of burglaries (up 42%), arson (up 52%) and motor vehicle thefts (up 33%) are also soaring.

Many activists at the budget hearing shouted "Defund, disarm and disband" the police and sheriff's departments. This shows a profound lack of concern for protecting the rights of victims. Just this year there have been 36 murders, 1,611 robberies and 29,000 total crime victims. If San Francisco disbands its police, who will investigate these and other crimes? Who will make arrests and prevent repeat crimes? If we defund the police substantially, won't the members of a smaller and more thinly-stretched police force become less effective, less visible and less accessible to the citizens of our communities?

If these cuts are implemented now, in just 3 weeks San Francisco may be scrambling to handle the 20,000-plus emergency mental health calls currently dispatched to the SFPD annually. Lives will be lost.

Similarly, the proposed Sheriff Department cutbacks could jeopardize safety, including the response during disasters. And it could harm ongoing inmate mental health programs, vocational training, high school classes, domestic violence counseling, and other services urgently needed for the transition from jail to civilian life.

Again, we urge you to protect public safety by investing in an improved Police Department this year, and redirecting funds thoughtfully and effectively next year, after appropriate planning and testing of new or alternative programs.

We urge you to avoid making major cutbacks this year.

Sincerely,

Carla Kozak Secretary, Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: File No. 200800 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:31:00 PM

From: Wendy Cowles <wacowles@gmail.com> **Sent:** Thursday, August 27, 2020 9:57 PM

To: Hillaryronen@sfgov.org

<kathyangus@gmail.com>

Subject: File No. 200800 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Ronen and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of 89 Banks Street, one block away from the proposed new homes at 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street.

The homes are proposed on currently undeveloped sites that would require construction of an extension of Folsom Street into land that is currently undeveloped. My understanding is that this Folsom Street right of way includes a significant 26" diameter underground PG&E gas pipeline - the same type of pipeline that catastrophically exploded in San Bruno.

For the safety of our neighborhood, I urge you to deny the Revised Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, and require a full Environmental Impact Report. The EIR should require comprehensive review of the situation by an independent and qualified expert, and address requirements for a site-specific emergency access and evaluation plan.

Respectfully, Wendy Cowles 89 Banks Street San Francisco, CA 94110

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: File No. 200800 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:32:00 PM

----Original Message----

From: Wendy Cowles <wacowles@gmail.com> Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 10:09 PM To: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Kathy Angus <kathyangus@gmail.com>

Subject: File No. 200800 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Ronen and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of 89 Banks Street, one block away from the proposed new homes at 3516 and 3526 Folsom Street.

The homes are proposed on currently undeveloped sites that would require construction of an extension of Folsom Street into land that is currently undeveloped. My understanding is that this Folsom Street right of way includes a significant 26" diameter underground PG&E gas pipeline - the same type of pipeline that catastrophically exploded in San Bruno.

For the safety of our neighborhood, I urge you to deny the Revised Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, and require a full Environmental Impact Report. The EIR should require comprehensive review of the situation by an independent and qualified expert, and address requirements for a site-specific emergency access and evaluation plan.

Respectfully, Wendy Cowles 89 Banks Street San Francisco, CA 94110

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Comment on Slow Streets Project being subject to environmental review (File No. 200883)

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:33:00 PM

From: Sanae Rosen <sanae.rosen@gmail.com> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 1, 2020 12:12 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Comment on Slow Streets Project being subject to environmental review

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I can't believe I'm writing to say that Slow Streets are good for the environment. We are literally surrounded by burning forests and polluted air, a preview of the world climate change is bringing, and we have to argue that slightly fewer cars is good for the environment?

Not to mention, during this global pandemic, allocating this tiny fraction of roads to slow streets provides essential spaces to walk, exercise and get out of the house, without having to risk crowded sidewalks, or the increasingly reckless and dangerous behaviour of cars on our almost empty roads.

People vulnerable to car traffic or exposure to coronavirus, such as children and seniors, especially need this space. But also, anyone who doesn't have a sprawling mansion, or who spends their time in the community instead of driving elsewhere, needs it too.

Sanae Rosen

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: File No. 200883 The Closure of Twin Peaks can damage your political career

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:34:00 PM

From: Alan Hugenot <captain.hugenot@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2020 11:28 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>

Subject: File No. 200883 The Closure of Twin Peaks can damage your political career

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

29 August 2020

RE:

File No. 200883 The Closure of Twin Peaks can damage your political career

TO: ALL SF Board of Supervisors: Sandra lee Fewer, Cathrine Stefani, Aaron Peskin, Gordon Mar, Dean PReston, Mat Haney, Norman Yee, Rafael Mandelman, Hillary Ronen, Shamann Walton, Ahsha Safai

Greetings:

I know this is normally read by your minions, but honestly you actually ought to read this yourself as to comprehend the full impact....... The Twin Peaks Neighborhood is truly PISSED.

Most SF Supervisors know that Senator **Diane Feinstein** and Speaker of the House **Nancy Pelosi**, are former San Francisco Supervisors, who worked their way up to national politics from their early positions on the SF Board of Supervisors..... This could happen for any one of you on today's Board of Supervisors...... Or not..... It is not just a natural progression, it must be earned.

But, to follow in their footsteps you will need friends not enemies..... Those two outstanding public servants were both honest enough to garner the friends and funds they needed to propel them to where they are today. Like them, that rise to political power depends on how much support you garner from influential people with funding and clout...... People like the folks who can afford the multi-million dollar homes on Twin Peaks overlooking the city, and whose neighborhood has been impacted by the city's STUPID closing of Twin Peaks.

Currently, the city's misguided bureaucracy is requesting your approval to permanently close Twin Peaks and restrict cars from driving to the top. Allowing that action alienates the vey people you need on your side in order to advance your political career.

Originally this closure was imposed to reduce COVID-19 transmissions, but now there is a motion to make it permanent. And even though Golden Gate Park is open again, Twin Peaks remains closed.

Really? SF City Parks can trust people in Golden Gate Park to stay six feet apart and to wear masks, but they can't trust them to do the same on Twin Peaks...? Bull shit !!! (excuse my French).

Yet, this proposed drastic action to permanently close Twin Peaks is being made without any environmental impact study. Permanently closing a public park designed specifically for visitors to park their cars and look at the view from Christmas Tree Point, which is an activity that has been going on for over a century, is blatantly STUPID...... For God's sake, people do not change just because some bureaucrat makes a rule.....

And, if this this bureaucratic travesty should be made permanent **on your watch as SF supervisors**, there will be personal consequences, which continue for there rest of your political career.

If the Board of Supervisors sanctions this kind of **not-thought-through** action by whatever city officials are actually at the bottom of it. (all the officials point the finger at someone else) you will be the ones who continue to pay for stupidly supporting this action, and not the bureaucrats. So, the only thing that matters for you is whether or not you as a SF Supervisor approve this abject stupidity.

If the Board of Supervisors does not reject this idea of making a permanent park closure, then you will have more than earned the title which city residents use to describe your august assembly as the "Board of Stupid-visors".

Half of the board's misguided actions every year make you and your board the laughing stock of city politics as well as nationally. Naively, only interested in garnering more votes and advancing your political careers, so you pass the stupidest legislation (*Rent control*, which prevents housing being built,..... *Sanctuary City* which increases crime....., etc. etc......) Yet, you were elected to think wisely and not rubber stamp what the bureaucracy tells you.

Your board exists to "supervise" the mayor and all his/her city departments.

On the other hand, we neighbors who have lived here for decades on Twin Peaks know that there has always been a crime problem on at the top, especially after sundown. But, this unwarranted closing of Twin Peaks does not get rid of the crime problem..... Instead, it just pushes it out of the city's park and onto Twin Peaks Blvd. and Burnett Avenue, where it actually makes it easier for the criminals.

Closing the park to get rid of a problem merely pushes it into the local neighborhoods, and that civic action is itself CRIMINAL

This abject stupidity has definitely created a great deal more crime in San Francisco, resulting in at least a dozen larcenies a day on Twin Peaks Blvd and Burnett Avenue. Very obvious to the residents who live there and mostly ignored by the city.

WHAT IS WRONG?

FIRST: Restricting the cars from Twin Peaks, was ordered without anyone bothering to do any environmental impact study or environmental impact statement and without any neighborhood input or buy in.

Christ, even a cursory study would have foreseen that the closure would only push the tourists seeking to park at the lookout, down onto Twin Peaks Blvd, and Burnett Avenue just outside the closed metal gate..... and would have several obvious detrimental effects.

Tourists have been coming here for decades and will continue to do so. Locking them out of the park has been ineffective..... After driving through the Bay area traffic to get here, they will not be put off. They just park and climb the hill......

And as far as spreading COVID 19, people manage to go to the grocery stores, Golden Gate Park (West of 36th Avenue) and everywhere else including restaurants wearing their masks and staying 6 feet apart...... So, why don't you trust them to do so on Twin Peaks?...... There is no reason whatsoever to treat this place any differently than any other location.

SECOND: This STUPID and NEAR-SIGHTED action has markedly increased crime in the city: But, of course without an environmental impact study how could you possibly have foreseen such problem would arise?...... Besides, once COVID19 got out of Wuhan it can never be "contained" again anyway. All the world wide government actions have not been able to stop it, but politicians have to pretend that they are "in control", so they have naively fomented a world wide depression.

Tourists can not get to the parking lot which was specifically designed to accommodate them, tour buses and the handicapped vehicles (and you talk about "access for all"?). This is entirely because the parking lot is located at the lookout on top...... as it should be,..... But with the closure about a mile from the top there is a continuous traffic jam on weekends. Tourists from all over the United States who have been coming to this lookout at Christmas Tree Point for many decades and have no idea that SF Parks and Recreation has closed off the lookout. Arrive at a closed gate and start to juggle for a parking place with all the other frustrated cars. After parking anywhere that is convenient they park and hike to the top.

Consequently, at all times of the day and half the night there are 25 to 35 cars (the majority from out of town) sitting idle and unwatched by anyone on a deserted street.

But, the thieves know that these abandoned cars on this nearly deserted country road, are all from out of town with luggage inside or on top, and this has created a bonanza for auto break in thieves. All the car owners have walked to the top of the peaks.

This is the opposite of what happens in the carefully designed parking lot at the top. In that parking there is safety in numbers when Twin Peaks is normally open and is teaming with people.

Instead, since the closure dozens of windows are broken daily. I was just up there near the gate again at 2:00 PM Sunday, (August 24) and a tourist's rental Mini had its window broken out, while they had been up on the peaks. I pointed to the broken window glass all over the non-parking area and asked the poor tourist, "You did not notice all the broken glass when you parked?

He looked down and said, "OMG that was probably he car just before me".

"Yeah, that is pretty much the problem, the last 15 cars here have all been broken into", I said.....

Now, All this time, both he and I were being carefully watched by the *thief's advanced lookout* who was loitering all around the corner listening in to what we were saying and waiting for the crowd and cops to thin out so he could give his buddies the go ahead by cell phone to return and break some more windows. (see photos attached).





The week before I had personally witnessed a lone thief drive up in broad daylight (maybe even on his lunch hour), jump out of his car while blocking the traffic from both directions, and indiscriminately break windows to take whatever was visible in the tourist cars parked on Burnett Avenue. This psychopath threw it all in his trunk and then swiftly drove away..... The entire heist taking about a minute and a half, he will open the several pieces of luggage later to see what he might have scored.

On the other hand, for decades when the cars were in the parking lot at the top of Twin Peaks as planned by Parks and Recreation, there have always been plenty of people around and the thieves couldn't do this without being seen and accosted, except very late at night.

Last week on Thursday (August 19) the SF Police trying to stop this window busting spree, did a daylight sting operation in the afternoon, where a uniformed police accosted the thieves at one end of the block and when they sped away from his uniform, the plain clothed police at the other end of the block placed a nail strip in the road which blew their tires and then they arrested four. Several others got away because they turned around and drove off in the opposite direction. But, this sting wouldn't be necessary at all if the road to the top of the peaks was not closed.

Prior to this closing of Twin Peaks, this was a quiet mostly crime free neighborhood. with only an occasional late night car theft (but the average is 117 cars stolen every day in SF, so this has to be considered "normal"). But, no break ins.

Indeed, one tenant two weeks ago with a new SUV parked on Burnett Avenue had his rear window broken out, when there was nothing in the car at all to take. The window was broken out just because it was an expensive new SUV parked in that group of cars mostly made

up of tourists and therefore JUST MIGHT have valuables inside. Nothing was taken, just a \$400 insurance claim and three days waiting to get the glass replaced.

THIRD: It creates a safety hazard to pedestrians: Since there are no sidewalks in this mostly unimproved block of Burnett Avenue where the tourists leave their cars and walk up the middle of the street. This open country road has a double line down the middle and is an automobile commuter path. So, these tourists are taking their life in their hands while the daily commuters speed by. The tourists have been coming to the twin peaks look out for 40 or 50 years, and they won't go away, just because the SF-MTA closed the park on a whim. So this hazardous, crime inducing situation will just continue for years.

FOURTH: IT "FUCKS UP" Lover's lane: Again, excuse my French, but at night, young people like to park on the hill and have coitus. Neighbors near the park entrance all know this because we have to collect and remove their used condoms when we voluntarily clean the litter out of our local park...... But, when Twin Peaks is closed off 24/7 this amorous activity is pushed down into the neighborhoods. The "lover's lane" cars have to park on Burnett Avenue where they can "see the view",

Last week, one tenant at Burnett North even had a "gaggle" of drunk 20 something girls on his flat gravel roof near midnight, they were supposedly "looking at the view". He accosted them saying he was trying to sleep in his apartment below the roof, but as high as they were they refused to get off his roof..... So, he told them simply that he was **going back to his apartment to get his gun**,..... and the "gaggle" then decided to leave. Luckily no now was shot, but SF residents should not have to be threatening obnoxious visitors on their roof with guns.

Another incident was some Japanese tourists who had all their valuables stolen including their passports and knocked on the door of a local house, unable to speak English and totally traumatized. Their memory of San Francisco will always be tainted with a horrible memory.

Needless-to-say, Neighbors all over the peaks are very angry at the SF City bureaucracy which created this problem. And, refuses to cease creating it. Their neighborhood apolitical organizations are currently watching exactly which you SF Board of Supervisors will now regarding this STUPID CLOSURE.

And, I can assure you none of them will forget, and there will be recompense...... Good or Bad.... and the choice is entirely yours.

SCREWING AN HONEST POLITICIAN'S CAREER: It only takes one person on the internet to screw a politician's chances during an election. You supervisors might be too young to recall what happened 20 years ago in the 2000 Presidential campaign for the Republican nomination when George W. Bush simply spread a rumor through social media to trash Senator John McCain, done at the last minute when Senator McCain had no time to get the word out against the absolute lies which were spread against him.

Or four years later when the Republicans again used social media to trash Democrat Senator John Kerry in the 2004 Presidential campaign (Wikipedia tells this whole story under the title "swiftboating").

But, the fact is that social media makes it so very easy to squash any political candidate by the timely spread of lies about them..... The political enemies you make as you pursue your political career will have very long memories..... Finally, because you are a public official, the laws protecting freedom of the press allows this to be done with license by anyone you have made into an enemy.

So, the best thing for the SF Board of Supervisors, would be to clear your name now, by not approving any permanent closure of Twin Peaks, and require SF Parks & Recreation to re-open the park to tourists, A.S.A.P, as it was originally designed to be, and to do this immediately.....

Best regards

Alan Hugenot, California native and one of many pissed off property owners. We promise to get back to you in a timely manner. The ball is in your court now.

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Twin Peaks Road Closure File No. 200883.

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:34:00 PM

Attachments: <u>Twin Peaks letter.docx</u>

From: Crowder, Dona < Dona. Crowder@cbnorcal.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:35 PM

To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <box do not be supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) shanasafai@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <Jacob.Bintliff@sfgov.org>

Subject: Twin Peaks Road Closure File No. 200883.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To San Francisco's District Supervisors:

My name is Dona Crowder resident of Clarendon Heights and member of Twin Peaks Improvement Association.

For a very long time we have advocated for police patrols on Twin Peaks due to the day time and night time trashing and drug/alcohol fueled bad behavior of repeat (mostly out of towners) which has resulted in theft, muggings and even murder at the public outlook area. This has affected not only neighbors but innocent local and foreign tourists to the site.

Now, the road to the top has been closed and the disturbing action has moved down below the gates at the corner of Twin Peaks and Burnett to the detriment of our neighbors there. Installing trash receptacles and having DPW visit occasionally is not sufficient.

Also, as a result there is more traffic through these streets and car breaks-ins continue without resolution. Crimes are committed with no consequence whatsoever, even in the event that someone is positively identified.

Inadequate staffing and resources for patrols on top of this basically leave us alone to fend for ourselves. We have done what is recommended by forming watch groups, installing cameras, informing each other and working with police by supplying information and photos when possible.

Included in SFMTA's Slow Street Program is the City's goal to make San Francisco's

dense neighborhoods more welcoming/accessible for people who want to travel on foot, bicycle or wheelchair and provide outdoor space for social distancing. The City's Slow Streets Program is supposed to be designed to limit thru-traffic on certain residential streets.

Twin Peaks Blvd above the gate is not a residential street. Further, Twin Peaks Blvd has specially marked lanes on both sides for cyclists and joggers/walkers.

By shutting access to the top of Twin Peaks, the City has simply relocated the car breakins, trash, traffic/parking congestion and noise from a non-residential area into our residential area.

The problems of disrespectful and sometimes dangerous visitors to Twin Peaks will continue if the supervisors, the city departments -our local government which is supposed to represent us- allow it to happen. We are asking for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dona Crowder 415-929-1900

Wire Fraud is Real. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions. Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

To San Francisco's District Supervisors:

8/28/2020

My name is Dona Crowder resident of Clarendon Heights and member of Twin Peaks Improvement Association.

For a very long time we have advocated for police patrols on Twin Peaks due to the day time and night time trashing and drug/alcohol fueled bad behavior of repeat (mostly out of towners) which has resulted in theft, muggings and even murder at the public outlook area. This has affected not only neighbors but innocent local and foreign tourists to the site.

Now, the road to the top has been closed and the disturbing action has moved down below the gates at the corner of Twin Peaks and Burnett to the detriment of our neighbors there. Installing trash receptacles and having DPW visit occasionally is not sufficient.

Also, as a result there is more traffic through these streets and car breaks-ins continue without resolution. Crimes are committed with no consequence whatsoever, even in the event that someone is positively identified.

Inadequate staffing and resources for patrols on top of this basically leave us alone to fend for ourselves. We have done what is recommended by forming watch groups, installing cameras, informing each other and working with police by supplying information and photos when possible.

Included in SFMTA's Slow Street Program is the City's goal to make San Francisco's dense neighborhoods more welcoming/accessible for people who want to travel on foot, bicycle or wheelchair and provide outdoor space for social distancing. The City's Slow Streets Program is supposed to be designed to limit thru-traffic on certain residential streets.

Twin Peaks Blvd above the gate is not a residential street. Further, Twin Peaks Blvd has specially marked lanes on both sides for cyclists and joggers/walkers.

By shutting access to the top of Twin Peaks, the City has simply relocated the car breakins, trash, traffic/parking congestion and noise from a non-residential area into our residential area.

The problems of disrespectful and sometimes dangerous visitors to Twin Peaks will continue if the supervisors, the city departments -our local government which is supposed to represent us- allow it to happen. We are asking for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dona Crowder 415-929-1900

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: File No. 200883 Public Comment

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 4:30:00 PM

From: Kurt Bonatz < kurt.bonatz@gmail.com> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 1, 2020 2:59 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: File No. 200883 Public Comment

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

It's disappointing to see CEQA abused yet again to oppose, slow down, and drive up the cost of infrastructure improvements that better not only the environment but also the community. I'm not at all surprised though to see it filed by some one who claimed recently that improved infrastructure for the safety of all road users plus the children and families attending a local elementary school was the community "want[ing] Page Street for their own private use". Somehow oblivious to private single occupancy vehicles already having a monopoly on our public infrastructure.

The slow streets have been a boon to just about everyone. Struggling local businesses can finally bring back customers, families feel safe with their children outside, it's significantly less noiser, the list goes on. I'm glad ALL the people of San Francisco are finally able to use the road for their own "private" use, and not just the privileged few who can't be bothered to worry about the safety of others or our environment. Personally, I'd also like to see any attempt at removing Slow Streets undergo CEQA review and approval.

Thank you for you time and consideration, Kurt

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: REOPEN CHURCH STREET NOW!

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 10:06:00 AM

From: Jamey Frank < jameyfrank@icloud.com> **Sent:** Wednesday, September 2, 2020 9:15 AM

Cc: MTA Board <MTABoard@sfmta.com>; tellmuni@sfmta.com; Temprano, Tom (BOS)

<tom.temprano@sfgov.org>

Subject: REOPEN CHURCH STREET NOW!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Now that the Muni Metro will be closed for yet another five months, please re-open our street!

The 200 block of Church St. is nothing more than a bus parking lot at this point, completely defeating the purpose. Only one of four remaining businesses on the block has chosen to create a parklet. But having idling buses park nearby makes this completely uninviting and not being used by dwindling customers. Businesses rely on deliveries and pickups, but are inaccessible.

This sad block resembles Detroit, and is example of city authoritarian transit policies creating urban blight. It makes no sense, so residents ignore the closure after yellow-vested MTA workers depart.

Return life to our street and reopen it now!

--Jamey Frank

On Aug 23, 2020, at 12:45 PM, Jamey Frank < <u>iameyfrank@icloud.com</u> > wrote:

Supervisors and Mayor,

SFMTA creates more Urban Blight and Suburban Flight!

Two more homeowners in our building on Church St., 40+ years in SF, have had enough of Draconian SF government, and are leaving the city.

75% of our street's businesses have died, and closing Church St. only destroys what's remaining. It's now a dead, lifeless, and empty neighborhood with no parking and jammed traffic on the few remaining surrounding streets, and scary street people everywhere.

14th St. - closed S. Van Ness to Folsom

16th St. - 50% parking loss and lane closure

17th St. - closed at Market, all parking lost Church St. to Sanchez St.

18th St. - closing at Castro

Noe St. - closing full length

Sanchez St. - closed through Noe Valley

Church St. - closed 15th to Market, all parking removed

Duboce St. - closed Church to Fillmore

Steiner St - closed Page to Oak

Page St. - closed entirely

....where does it end?

SFMTA in its obsessive hatred of vehicles has ruined local businesses, and run families and seniors out of town.

Stop Urban Blight and Suburban Flight!
Reopen our streets NOW!

—Jamey Frank, Church St. Neighborhood Assoc.

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: Twin Peaks...Help!

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:20:00 AM

From: Gale Bradley <galesemail@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, September 7, 2020 12:22 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston <DeanPreston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>

Subject: Twin Peaks...Help!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Whoever is responsible for closing Twin Peaks created a dangerous ongoing problem that did not exist before.

You have heard from many of the residents and visitors regarding the lack of social distancing, the unmanageable crush of cars and traffic at TwinPeaks Blvd & Burnett Ave. (Yesterday several Limos were stuck and could not turn around.) There are piles of garbage dumped daily and cars broken into day and night. The nighttime drug and drinking parties are beyond dangerous and disturbing.

There is only one solution to this recently created problem... go back to the way it has been and worked for years.


The View platform has room for people to feel safe.

This discourages car break ins as people can be near their cars. And many tourist can actually see the View without getting out of their cars .

The late night parties have always been on top of the peaks and it has never been solved. Moving that problem into our neighborhood hasn't solved a thing

Please restore this beautiful peaceful neighborhood.

Thank you Gale Bradley



















To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Unable To Comment During Virtual Public Hearing (File No. 200883)... Webex System Failed...

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:20:00 AM

From: Gary Russ <gary.russ@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 7:52 PM

To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>

Cc: 'Mary Miles' <page364@earthlink.net>

Subject: Unable To Comment During Virtual Public Hearing (File No. 200883)... Webex System

Failed...

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello District Supervisor Yee and Clerk Of The Board Angela Calvillo:

Just want you both to know I was listening to the September 1, 2020, Public Hearing (File No. 200883) but unable to share my comments. No matter how many times I raised my hand via the Webex system, I was not allowed to speak. I wonder how many other people had that experience. Very frustrating.

That day, I had spent a few hours boiling down my messaging for the Board to 2 minutes and then never got to present any of my comments to the Board. So disappointing and frustrating.

I was going to advocate in favor of the continuance based on my own experience with what happens when the City fails to conduct an environmental review and fails to solicit neighborhood feedback before deciding to close a street whether temporarily or even permanently.

My Best,

Gary R. Russ 5 Burnett Avenue North, Apt. 6 San Francisco, CA 94131 gary.russ@sbcglobal.net

BOS-11 File No. 200891

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Cc: <u>BOS Legislation, (BOS)</u>

Subject: FW: Letter of Support for 1088 Howard (File No. 200891)

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 5:03:00 PM
Attachments: YIMBY Action Letter of Support 1088 Howard.pdf

From: Gillian Pressman <gillian@yimbyaction.org> **Sent:** Wednesday, September 2, 2020 4:30 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Letter of Support for 1088 Howard

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

YIMBY Action is pleased to submit the attached letter of support for the proposed project at 1088 Howard Street. We hope you approve this project.

Thank you!

--

Gillian Pressman

Director of Development *She/her* 914-874-4973

L				



YIMBY Action advocates for welcoming communities where everyone can thrive.

yimbyaction.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

September 2, 2020

RE: Support for 1088 Howard St.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

YIMBY Action is pleased to support the proposed project at 1088 Howard Street. This project would build 24 units of housing on the site of a vacant one-story building and parking lot. This project will help address our citywide housing shortage and in particular, our need for more homes in communities like SOMA, just blocks away from the Civic Center BART/Muni Metro station. Furthermore, this is a car-free project that will promote walking and bicycling by providing 26 bicycle spaces. This project was approved unanimously by the SF Planning Commission as well.

YIMBY Action is a network of pro-housing activists fighting for more inclusive housing policies. Our vision is an integrated society where every person has access to a safe, affordable home near jobs, services, and opportunity.

San Francisco's severe housing shortage is causing skyrocketing homelessness and poverty, crippling our economy, and leading to debilitating commutes that exacerbate our global climate crisis. These impacts fall disproportionately on our city's low-income workers and families, and disproportionately deny communities of color access to opportunity. If we strive to be a society that advances racial and class justice, we must do more to ensure abundant housing in our region. This project will help address the housing shortage and ensure a welcoming San Francisco where everyone can thrive.

Best regards,

Laura Foote

YIMBY Action, Executive Director



BOS-11 File No. 200951

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Support for BHC Admin Code amendment BOS file 200951

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:40:00 AM

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 4:19 PM

To: Wagner, Greg (DPH) <greg.wagner@sfdph.org>

Cc: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS)

<gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Young,

Victor (BOS) < victor.young@sfgov.org>

Subject: Support for BHC Admin Code amendment BOS file 200951

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Greg,

It has been a very long time since we spoke, when you were in the Mayor's Budget Office. I am happy that you are still at DPH - they need really need you! I am prompted to send you my thoughts on the many issues raised by the SFMHEF's administration of the Behavioral Health Commission that I sent to Supervisor Stefani on June 10, 2020 copied below, now that there is pending legislation at the BOS, file #200951. I fully support the proposed ordinance to require DPH to provide administrative staff to BHC. DPH does not need more budgetary commitments to fund, but I feel that DPH and you are the best solution to providing the missing fiscal integrity to BHC.

Please let me know if I can provide you with any additional support or information.

Best wishes, Nancy Wuerfel

RE: Request for a performance audit on Behavioral Health Commission issues 6/10/20

Dear Supervisor Stefani:

BRAVO to you for your integrity to resign from the Behavioral Health Commission! You are right on point with the issues you discussed with S.F. Examiner Staff Writer Joshua Sabatini. I thank you both for making public these serious matters confronting the Commission who is responsible for the oversight of the city's mental health issues.

I was first drawn to reading about your resignation when I saw that a city commission actually had a fiscal agent. I am not aware of any other city board or

commission that uses a fiscal agent to perform administrative commission activities and manage its costs. I believe that all other government review bodies are staffed by city workers, not through contractors, and have budgets as part of the city's Annual Budget process.

You correctly conclude: "I do not believe the current structure of the commission best serves the residents of the city and county of San Francisco." There is a commingling of the following duties and responsibilities that leads to a lack of checks and balances, a lack of appropriate oversight of each entity, and possible personal liability to board members. I believe the following issues are serious enough for you to request a BOS Budget Analyst Performance Audit of the relationship between and the legal responsibilities of the city and the nonprofit corporate contractor. This review is in addition to the financial audit and investigations the city is now conducting.

- 1) A city authorized Commission and a private nonprofit corporation both share the same 17 people as board members to serve two separate entities, yet each board has different duties and each board has different controlling documents one by law and one by bylaws. The corporate bylaws specify that SFMHEF directors must be currently serving members of the San Francisco Mental Health Advisory Board, but the Administrative Code does not mention this requirement that city commissioners must also serve as nonprofit board members, therefore exposing Commission members to legal responsibilities (see item 6 below). The Articles of Incorporation for SFMHEF state: "The powers of this corporation shall be exercised, its properties controlled and its affairs conducted by a board of directors known as the Board of Directors." The Administrative Code Sec. 15.12 states: "The [Behavioral Health] Commission shall consist of 17 members..." with the Duties detailed in Sec. 15.14. The two board structures are different to achieve different objectives.
- 2) The power for each board to act regarding financial matters is not the same. The Charter Section 2.114 precludes a member of the BOS from interfering in the administrative matters of government operations, so the Commission is powerless to act to correct wrong doing in the administration of the city contract with SFMHEF or in other monetary transactions. However, the corporation bylaws require and empower its board of directors to act: "All funds of the corporation shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the corporation in such banks, trust companies or other depositories as the Board of Directors_may select."
- 3) The Charter Section 4.102 requires each appointive board or commission to "appoint an executive secretary to manage the affairs and operations of the board or commission." There is no record that Commission has acted to appoint an executive secretary. Instead, the Commission has an Executive Director to manage the affairs of the Commission, who is the same person who acts as the Executive Director for SFMHEF. This person is being paid as a city contractor governed by corporate bylaws, not as a city employee. It is not clear if the former Mental Health Board ever officially approved the required executive secretary position to be held by a non-city employee, regardless of the funding of the individual. This is a matter of who supervises this position.

- 4) There is no public record of an approved annual budget specifically for the Commission which should include both the source of revenue and the specific expenses to be paid. There is no public copy of the contract between the Department of Public Health and SFMHEF, nor is there any accounting of the specific services invoiced to support contractual payments to the corporation, which should be separate from paying any Commission expenses, nor is there any public reconciliation of all revenue sources with all expenses.
- 5) There is no independent review or accounting of the outside bank statements for SFMHEF. The bylaws state that "All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any director or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time." The bylaws are silent on the subject of audits. The Annual Registration Renewal Fee Report to the Attorney General of California (RRF-1 form) asks the charity completing the form to answer questions including "During this reporting period, did the organization receive any governmental funding? If so, provide an attachment listing the name of the agency, mailing address, contact person, an telephone number" and "Did your organization have prepared an audited financial statement in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles for this reporting period?" SFMHEF has answered NO to both questions on all filings since 2006. On their 990 Schedule O IRS filing for 2017, the question about the SFMHEF review process was answered by "No review was or will be conducted" and the question about availability of other public documents from SFMHEF was answered "No other documents available to the public." There is no transparency provided through these legal filings.
- 6) There is currently a lack of timely submission of reports. Most important is the filing to the Attorney General of the Annual Review form RRF-1 for 2019 by SFMHEF. The renewal was due by 11/15/19 but the filing was not received until 5/15/20 and is now "in process." There is liability to SFMHEF board for late fees for each month reports are delinquent, and directors and officers responsible for failure to timely file these reports are also personally liable for payment of all late fees, penalties, interest and other costs incurred to restore exempt status. Charitable assets cannot be used to pay these avoidable costs. Also, I note that the posting online of Commission meeting minutes has occurred for only one meeting on February 19, 2020, even through there have been 13 Commission meetings with agendas in 2020. There are no minutes of the Retreat held in December 2019. Commission secretarial duties need corrective attention, as well as Directors' attention to SFMHEF filings.

I would appreciate your sending me a copy of your resignation letter from the Commission and the April 21st letter you wrote to Dr. Grant Colfax for my files. Thanks!

Thank you for considering my comments and for bringing these matters to the attention of the public. Thanks to Mr. Sabatini for his clear reporting on the complex relationships and issues facing the Behavioral Health Commission. Please let me know if I can provide you with any additional information from my research.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel

cc: Joshua Sabatini SFExaminer

BOS-11 File No. 200955

From: <u>anastasia Yovanopoulos</u>
To: <u>Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)</u>

Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS);

Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); BOS-

<u>egislative Aides</u>

Subject: Fw: ABAG

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 5:31:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

As your District #8 constituent, I ask you to vote for the resolution co-sponsored by Supervisors Mar, Ronen, Walton, Fewer and Preston- "urging ABAG in the RHNA Process, to focus on unmet needs for affordable housing and maintain the current RHNA allocation level of above-moderate housing in San Francisco in its upcoming RHNA process".

The upcoming RHNA levels will increase to 2.35 higher! There is a risk that San Francisco will have its market-rate RHNA allocation double, or more, in order to absorb the overall regional determination increase resulting from under-performance by other cities.

In the current RHNA cycle, San Francisco has met and exceeded its RHNA for above-moderate/market rate housing, over-performing - by producing 140 % of the current eight- year goal which carries through 2021.

We've fallen significantly short of meeting our affordable housing RHNA allocation for low- and moderate-income goals, achieving only 37 % primarily due to lack of sufficient dedicated revenue sources.

 Developers choose to produce high-end or market rate units over low and moderate-income units because it is more profitable for their bottom-line, causing an imbalance in the supply side of affordable units.

Consider the fact that Planning Department's 2018 Housing Trends and Needs Report reflects that a majority of lower income homeowner households (earning <80% of AMI) are now cost burdened, and that overcrowding disproportionately impacts low-income households, including 12% of very low-income households and 10% of low-income households- Also consider the racial disparities that exist: Black, American Indian, and Latinx households are more severely burdened by housing costs and than White households.

San Francisco's resolution urges ABAG

to focus on unmet RHNA needs for housing affordable to low- and moderate-

income residents experiencing cost burden and overcrowding in San Francisco

• to maintain and not increase the current eight-year allocation level of abovemoderate "market-rate" housing to San Francisco in the 2022-2030 RHNA cycle

Moreover, our city must not support a RHNA allocation that would trigger SB35 byright approvals for market-rate housing in San Francisco because it would further incentivize land speculation, associated with displacement and regional segregation.

An increase in the market-rate housing allocation to San Francisco in the ABAG RHNA process would likely trigger mandatory by-right approvals of all market-rate housing by state law due to Senate Bill 35 adopted in 2017; and by-right approvals of market-rate development by state law in San Francisco would incentivize land speculation and speculative development entitlements in gentrifying communities of color, which is associated with racial and socioeconomic demographic shifts, evictions, displacement, further regional segregation, and exacerbated racial disparities.

Presently there's a surplus of vacant high-end and market rate units in our city.

Please vote for this resolution. Thank You. Sincerely,

Anastasia Yovanopoulos District #8 tenant

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: support for resolution Item 16, file # 200955

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:29:00 PM

From: Kathy Lipscomb < kathylipscomb2@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:15 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: support for resolution Item 16, file # 200955

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

September 1, 2020

Board of Supervisors, (BOS), <u>board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org</u>> Please add this correspondence to the legislative file.

Support for Resolution Item 16, File # 200955

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Resolution Item 16, File # 200955 regarding the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process and its implications for San Francisco.

It's time for the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to address the Bay Area's *true* unmet housing needs, and for San Francisco to do its part.

San Francisco needs to focus on homes for our essential workers and their families, especially those facing the "unmet needs" identified by ABAG of high housing costs and severe overcrowding.

We need to provide stable communities for Black and Brown residents facing gentrification and displacement pressures associated with runaway land speculation and unaffordable housing.

And we must work toward a truly racially integrated and just Bay Area, reversing the regional segregation pushing people of color to the edges of the metropolitan area, far from jobs, services and transit, that are the result of concentrating unaffordable housing in our central

cities.

Thank you, and please support Resolution 200955, urging ABAG to focus on unmet needs for housing affordable to low- and moderate-income residents, and to not increase San Francisco's annual allocation of unaffordable market-rate housing.

Kathy Lipscomb

member, Senior & Disability Action

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SFADC" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sfadc-forum+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sfadc-forum/CAOMfZHk-nw0avpCM4moGL%2BO7rp2AnYoRNE-gfzVt6EMTVQuAvQ%40mail.gmail.com.

2 Attachments

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Gordon Mar"s Resolution for Affordable Housing First

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 1:30:00 PM

From: Barbara Delaney <barbarabdelaney@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Subject: Gordon Mar's Resolution for Affordable Housing First

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Supervisors,

I understand you will be voting tomorrow on Mr. Mar's resolution and that there will be another opportunity for public comment before the vote.

I called in last week to support this resolution and I stayed on the phone to hear what others were saying. I was struck by the enormous similarity among the callers who called to oppose the resolution - not only in the way they expressed themselves but also in their arguments. Many of them, for instance, seemed to imply that because San Francisco was not subject to fires and had clean air there needed to be more market rate housing so people outside the city could live here. I was speechless at the entitlement of those speakers who argued that those who can afford market rate housing should be able to buy it in SF to escape fire and bad air in the surrounding counties.

What also struck me, however, was the process of public comment in these days of Covid and remote hearings. While I'm

sure this allows more people to participate, it also allows for more fraud and deception. The similarity of the Opposed speakers made this all too obvious.

Here are the problems:

- 1. A caller can be whoever they want to be. They may not have any interest in the issue at all but someone who does may have paid them to call in, may have paid many of them to call in and provided them with scripts. I know that land use attorneys do this for planning commission hearings (they claim they will enlist "community and neighborhood support for your project") and it is just possible that this scam may have moved on to BOS meetings.
- 2. While it is wonderful that there is time for public comment, in this particular case the people who are most affected by the results are at opposite ends of the wealth spectrum. People who need affordable housing are the ones least likely to be able to take time out of their day to wait to speak at a BOS meeting (if they even knew one was going on or how to call in). The system is unfairly weighted against these people who need affordable housing but do not have the resources to make their voices heard. There is more than enough market rate housing in the city at the moment so why would anyone who didn't stand to profit from developing market rate housing bother to call in to oppose a resolution that required more affordable housing before more market rate housing?
- 3. Affordable housing is anathema to property developers which is why they so often opt to buy their way out of the affordable housing requirement in new construction (which is now so low as to be nearly useless). They are in it for the money, not for the economic diversity or the health of the city's housing stock for which they care nothing. Most of them don't even live here but they love the development friendly climate which allows them to harvest great profits at the expense of the people of San Francisco.

You are our representatives and we who need affordable housing are in all your districts. PLEASE SUPPORT GORDAN MAR'S RESOLUTION. Most of us have no one but you to look after our bigger picture interests. The developers opposing this resolution will exploit the limited available land in SF (with the help of ABAG and the RHNA quotas) for their own gain until there will be no place left to build affordable housing unless you require that affordable housing goals are met before any market rate housing is built. PLEASE HELP US. Thank you.

These are the words, opinions and pleas of

Barbara Delaney
Outer Sunset Activists United

Barbara Delaney

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Market Rate Housing + Build the west side Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 10:23:00 AM

From: Jordan Staniscia < jordan.staniscia@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 5:15 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani,

Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;

Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman
(BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff

(BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>

Subject: Market Rate Housing + Build the west side

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mayor Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am a 28 year-old man who has lived in San Francisco for 10 years. The rent and cost to purchase a home or condo in San Francisco is known as being the highest globally. As I sit and listen to the board about to vote to ask for a smaller RHNA allocation, I can't help but think that San Francisco wants me to move away.

I want to have my children here. I want to start a family here. But at every turn the city government upholds the status quo—expensive housing for the rich and not building new housing here.

Market rate and affordability are all needed! I am a middle class citizen and I have competed constantly for the same housing with our less well off residents. I've lived in 100 year old buildings here and paid the same rent as a brand new building. This is an insane perversion of supply and demand.

Build. More. Housing. Period. All of it!

Build on the West side for once too and stop protecting the millionaires and billionaire land-owning class. Upzone every parcel! We can solve this if we'd only try. Don't force me out, please.

Jordan

From: Josette Goedert

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination and Conditional Use Authorization - Proposed Project - 2001-37th

Avenue CUA #2018-012648

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 11:48:35 AM

Attachments: <u>IMG 9200 (1).MOV</u>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Hi Board of Supervisors,

My name is Josette Goedert and I live in the Sunset District at 2837 Rivera Street and I support the SI Neighborhood Association appeals against the proposed Saint Ignatius Stadium Lights.

We have lived directly across from Saint Ignatius for 8 years now (39th and Rivera) and their level of consideration has gone significantly down. At first we were able to come home and enjoy our home on the weekends or evenings, but now it's almost out of question. Every single weekend they either have a game or have rented out their fields to external organizations such as pee-wee football, lacrosse, soccer, frisbee golf, all day activities or sports camps, etc. If we need to leave the house we know that we will not get parking anywhere near our home or have any peace and quiet. The events start early in the morning (sometimes blowing whistles and the loudspeaker on as early as 6:45 AM on a Saturday) to not ending until way past 4 or 5 PM in the evening. This goes on almost every weekend. Saint Ignatius also starts some practices Monday through Friday with whistles blowing again as early as 6:45 AM.

We've had our driveway blocked so many times that we have resorted to calling SFMTA to issue tickets because we have no other choice. I personally have had SI parents blatantly ask me if I was going anywhere "anytime soon", so that they could illegally block my driveway because they were late for an event at the school and they couldn't find close parking. I had to let those parents know that if they remained parked in my driveway that I would tow them and that it didn't matter if I had anywhere to go - I need access to my car in the garage. I have called the school several times to get their students to move their cars out of my driveway or out of my neighbors driveway. Anytime I have politely asked a student to move their vehicle 9 times out of 10 they have argued with me and then I tell them that they can get their car out of the impound if they park there. They then move their vehicles out of my driveway. I have included a photo of their student's vehicle in my driveway from May 5th, 2015. When I called the school and SFMTA - the student arrived just before SFMTA did and moved their vehicle. On this particular occasion I was significantly late for a meeting that day due to their student parking in my driveway and I told the SI office that, but they didn't seem to care, but only offered the rebuttal of "the student's know the rules and we had them move their vehicle."

On weekends it's worse because the people who come from outside the city never obey the red on the driveway. We had a pickup truck park in between my driveway and our neighbors (mind you a Prius can fit there, but nothing bigger). I then had to argue with the driver to move his truck and he told me that he was late for his son's football game and I had to let him know that his truck would be in the impound if he didn't move it. Almost every week and weekend I have to let someone know to not park in my driveway. The last time I called

SFMTA was last November on a weekend and the driver argued with SFMTA for giving them a ticket. Due to Covid this year we have not had to call or let someone know to not park in our driveway.

When Saint Ignatius had their temporary lights up last year they were shining directly into our home. We could turn the lights off in our house and have it still be illuminated brightly. SI did not turn the lights off when they were supposed to and sometimes they stayed on for at least another hour after they were supposed to be turned off. This would be as late as 10 PM some nights. The level of consistent noise from the loud speaker is blaring. I have included a video from their practice on June 15, 2020 at 4:05 PM. This is a small example of how loud it is, but please note it's much louder for games and for all day weekend events and games.

Overall, SI isn't a good neighbor and now that we have a 1 year old daughter - I would like to be able to keep her naptime and bedtime routine without consistent noise, crowds, loud speakers and bright lights. Saint Ignatius has not taken into consideration how this will affect the small children in the community when the lights won't go off until late shining directly into their bedrooms. Having the lights be used for up to 150 nights per year is absolutely ludicrous and in the end potentially causes our child's nighttime routine to be drastically changed. They have not taken into consideration how the small children in the neighborhood would be affected by their NON-ESSENTIAL 90 foot lights. The SF Planning's yes vote has shown our community that the city favors Saint Ignatius and their students that pay an exorbitant amount of tuition for a project that doesn't directly affect their education, but negatively affects the Outer Sunset. The Saint Ignatius students and parents do not have to live with these lights and 5G technology across from their homes. They will drive home, which is mostly outside of San Francisco city limits.

Please note the negative effects on our neighborhood, especially those living directly across the street:

- These lights will be enormous (90 feet!) / out of character for our residential neighborhood and will be shining directly into our windows
- If the lights are built enforcement of SF Planning's rules is left up to the neighbors to report
- SI was granted the permit without any environmental, parking or health studies to prove that this project should not move forward
- SI will not engage with the neighbors to discuss our concerns and have flat out refused to hear our alternatives / the complete opposite of what they tout themselves as "Good Neighbor Program"
- Extending the activities to late evening will further compound the issues we already have to endure every weekend from SI and will now be Monday through Sunday this is not okay!
- These lights will permanently alter the livability of our Sunset neighborhood

Please note that it remains beneficial to preserve the family oriented environment that has been developing over the years for young families here in the Outer Sunset. I cannot in good conscience find anything positive with their proposal for 90 foot lights, up to 150 nights a year field usage and 5G technology. Saint Ignatius likes to tout themselves as good neighbors, but they are anything but that. PLEASE VOTE NO.

Best,

Josette

From: Kathy Howard

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Haney, Matt

(BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ronen,

Hillary; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

Subject: 9-22-20 BOS meeting -- Appeal of Saint Ignatius staidum lighting project.

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:09:03 PM

Attachments: 2020-07-22 Saint Ignatius - Sierra Club comments -.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Attached please a letter from the Sierra Club in support of the Appeal of the Saint Ignatius stadium lighting project.

The potential for negative environmental impacts from this project and the lack of effective community

participation are such that the Sierra Club supports a full Environmental Impact Report be completed

before this project can be approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard

SF Group Executive Committee, member SF Group Conservation Committee, member California Conservation Committee, past member



San Francisco Bay Chapter

Serving Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Francisco counties

July 22, 2020

Mr. Joel Koppel, President San Francisco Planning Commission City Hall San Francisco, CA

Re: PLANNING CASE NUMBER 2018-012648CUA SAINT IGNATIUS STADIUM LIGHTING PROJECT

Dear President Koppel,

The Saint Ignatius (SI) Stadium Lighting project will install 90 foot tall utility poles with extensive night sports lighting, projected to be in use up to 200 nights a year, for sporting events that will both involve and attract large numbers of people from outside of the local community. We are concerned with the combined adverse effects of light and glare, noise, and traffic congestion on the community and the surrounding environment.

An Environmental Impact Report is needed

The SI stadium lighting project has received a categorical exemption under CEQA; however, a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is needed to understand this project's impacts in terms of light pollution, nighttime noise pollution, impacts to wildlife and increased VMT (vehicle miles travelled) in this residential neighborhood. The SI Stadium Lighting project should not be approved until these impacts have been fully evaluated.

Wildlife Impacts

Western San Francisco is on the Pacific Flyway. Artificial night lighting can have negative impacts on the nesting habits and migration patterns of many species of birds. The proposed project could cause significant light pollution, even with fully shielded fixtures. This can be exacerbated by the fog that often blankets the area and could increase ambient illumination over a wide area to levels that are ecologically disruptive.

The school is adjacent to the Sunset Boulevard Greenbelt and the Sunset Community Garden. As of July 2020, 67 different species of birds have been recorded in the area on ebird. An EIR is needed to evaluate the impact on nesting birds, migrating birds, and bats currently living in the vicinity of the project.

Health Impacts

Studies commissioned by the community have concluded that the quantity, height, and planned frequent use of the lights will create a significant impact on the health and well-being of those living near the fields – especially the children living directly adjacent to the school. These findings need to be

Page 1 of 2

Sierra Club

evaluated in an EIR.

Lack of Dialogue and Inclusion

The Sierra Club supports the Jemez Principles, the goals of which are to "achieve just societies that include all people in decision-making" and to "be sure that relevant voices of people directly affected are heard." ¹ However, the community has expressed frustration with a lack of meaningful engagements by SI with the community and with SI's refusal to discuss community-proposed alternatives. A full EIR would present alternatives that could benefit both parties.

Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)

The creation of a night-time lighted sports field will likely result in increased traffic on Sunset Blvd and local streets. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) will likely increase. This needs to be evaluated in an EIR.

Conclusion

The potential for negative environmental impacts from this project and the lack of effective community participation are such that the Sierra Club supports a full Environmental Impact Report be completed before this project can be approved.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

SF Group Executive Committee, member SF Group Conservation Committee, member California Conservation Committee, past member

CC: Planning Commissioners Board of Supervisors Commission Secretary

Katherine Haward

¹ "Jemez Principles," This policy was developed by European-American representatives for Environmental and Economic Justice and widely used in the development of environmental policy. http://www.ejnet.org/ej/jemez.pdf

From: <u>Chandrika Murthy</u>

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination and Conditional Use Authorization - Proposed Project - 2001-37th

Avenue CUA #2018-012648

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:54:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Chandrika Murthy and I live in the Sunset District at 2214 39th Street. I support the SI Neighborhood Association appeals against the proposed Saint Ignatius Permanent Stadium Lights

I have lived in SF for 30 years and had a number of concerns about the plans to erect these lights. I do not believe this is in the best interests of the neighborhood or the students of SI. My daughter is a current student at SI, and we love SI! I hope my 4-year old twins can attend SI as well.

This project was approved without any Environmental or Health impact studies. I think the current health crisis should lead all of us to examine plans for growth through the lens of health and wellness.

The school has existing facilities that are lighted that are utilized for practice. While I understand the students may think they "need" more lights, it will help them mature to accept that neighborhood residents also have needs.

Please keep in mind the young children in the area that will have their bedtime impacted by noise 150 days a year!

I would like you to ensure that Environmental or Health impact studies are conducted before these lights are installed. The impact to the habitat and human health is not yet known. Let us make this important decision based on **science**, not who has the most influence in City Hall.

Thank you Chandrika From: carole gilbert
Cc: Carole Gilbert

Subject: Saint Ignatius Lighting - Please Save My Neighborhood Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:12:10 AM

Attachments: SI letter.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

September 9, 2020

My name is: Carole Gilbert.

I live at: 2179 40th Ave SF CA 94116

I have lived here since 1984, 36 years. In that time I have watched St Ignatius high school expand both physically and with the student body population.

In recent years we have had a lot of trouble with students and parents blocking the driveway. I've had vehicles ticketed and now have turned to having them towed due to the seemingly lack of consideration for our neighborhood.

During the night and weekend games we typically have parents and students double parking on 39th Ave. and Rivera St. Due to double parking, the 48 Quintara bus is not able to turn on 39th Avenue, It is forced to change its route and come down 40th Avenue. The police do not seem to be monitoring this situation I have seen motorcycle police just watching the games but not monitoring the issues mentioned above.

The temporary lighting that SI tested out lit up the sky. It looked like daylight was coming in our windows that face the SI field. We always can hear the loud speakers blaring, and the crowds cheering. This is extremely disruptive and once SI increases their night time events to 150 + events per year it will be impossible to relax in my home in the evening. The games/practices will be until 10 PM during week nights and weekends. The crowds that leave will linger walking to their cars, making noise, tossing liter and racing up our streets. Why students need to play games and practice until 10 PM when they should be home doing homework and sleeping is beyond me.

The public San Francisco high schools do not have night games at their schools. When this occurs, they play at Kezar Stadium they don't disturb their neighbors. Why can't SI do this?

I find this behavior a detriment to our ability to enjoy our quiet home life. Noise, double parking, trash, people hanging out are not acceptable to me.

Please reconsider their petition for this lighting project. Do not allow them to disrupt our neighborhood. I know if you lived in our neighborhood you would not want this to move forward.

Thank you, Carole Gilbert

p: BOS-Supervisors

Subject: FW: A Tale of Two Sisters! Re: Updated Mapping Radioactive Elements - Known Radionuclides of Concern @ HPNS 08/31/20

t: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:45:00 AM hments: 67A62F38-2A44-4214-93AF-91BF9F5700C1.png BC4CD5B4-6566-48A1-9536-5EEAF73539E4.png

From: Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD - Golden State MD <ahimsaportersumchaimd@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:29 AM

To: ramona.tascoe@alumni.ucsf.edu; ajijic51@mac.com; Raymond Tompkins <rtomp@sbcglobal.net>; bradley@greenaction.org; kevyn11@yahoo.com; cbloggy@gmail.com; Rebecca Bowe <rebecca.bowe@gmail.com>; Marya, Rupa (UCSF) <Rupa.Marya@ucsf.edu>; hpbiomonitoring@comcast.net

Cc: Derek Robinson < derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil; kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil; laura.duchnak@navy.mil; Aragon, Tomas (DPH) < tomas.aragon@sfdph.org>; Colfax, Grant (DPH) < grant.colfax@sfdph.org>; Yolanda Sanchez < sanchez.yolanda@epa.gov>; Wayne.Praskins@epa.gov; kkang@ggu.edu; Woodruff, Tracey (UCSF) < Tracey.Woodruff@ucsf.edu>; Pierce, Karen (DPH) < karen.pierce@sfdph.org>; Susan.Fanelli@cdph.ca.gov; Greger, Robert@CDPH < Robert.Greger@cdph.ca.gov>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) < shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) < shorman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) </ >

<boxed.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; john.balmes@medicine.ucsf.edu; Harrison, Robert (UCSF) <Robert.Harrison@ucsf.edu>; Hiatt, Robert (UCSF) <Robert.Hiatt@ucsf.edu>; larryrosemd@sbcglobal.net; chancellor@ucsf.edu; president@ucop.edu; kathryn.higley@oregonstate.edu

Subject: A Tale of Two Sisters! Re: Updated Mapping Radioactive Elements - Known Radionuclides of Concern @ HPNS 08/31/20

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

You can't make this shit up! I have conducted an extensive advanced search of human biomonitoring research archives, including the National Human Exposure Assessment Survey. There are no biomonitoring research studies that have detected an "aggregate" of elements with known radioisotopes in multiple screenings.

----- Original Message -----

From: Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD <asumchai@gmail.com>

To: Mary Ratcliff <editor@sfbayview.com>

Cc: Ahimsa Porter Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD NSCA-CPT < Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD @Comcast.net >

Date: 09/01/2020 8:09 AM

Subject: A Tale of Two Sisters! Re: Updated Mapping Radioactive Elements - Known Radionuclides of Concern @ HPNS 08/31/20

No wonder the lab delayed in releasing the results...they had to be confirmed by a senior lab tech. ZB and TB are your neighbors on Shafter. Look at their findings! ZB has lived in the same house for 16 years, located within four blocks of the shipyard's South Basin and Parcel E shoreline. Her sister lived in the house for years but moved to an apartment on Presidio last year. She moved back this year to be with her sister who is in failing health...for obvious reasons. Neither sister is a party to any lawsuit.

The two lab results are stacked on top of each other and start with lead. Note Arsenic, Gadolinium, Nickel, Rubidium, Thallium, Copper, Manganese and Vanadium are all elevated to floridly toxic!!! Both sisters also fit criteria for the South Basin Cluster.


Element	Reference R	ange	TMPL	Reference Range
Lead	0.8			<= 1.4
Mercury	⟨dl			<= 2.19
Aluminum	13.1			<= 22.3
Antimony	⟨dl			<= 0.149
Arsenic		52		<= 50
Barium	2.2			<= 6.7
Bismuth	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 2.28</td></dl<>			<= 2.28
Cadmium	0.39)		<= 0.64
Cesium	8.5			<= 10.5
Gadolinium			3.788	<= 0.019
Gallium	⟨dl			<= 0.028
Nickel	3.6	67		<= 3.88
Niobium	⟨dl			<= 0.084
Platinum	⟨dl			<= 0.033
Rubidium			3,738	<= 2,263
Thallium	0.	434		<= 0.298
Thorium	⟨dl			<= 4.189
Tin	0.93			<= 2.04
Tungsten	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.211</td></dl<>			<= 0.211
Uranium	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.026</td></dl<>			<= 0.026

Element	Reference Range	Reference Range
Chromium	5.3	0.6-9.4
Cobalt	0.10	0.01-2.60
Copper	11.2	4.0-11.4
Iron	32	5-64
Lithium	47	9-129
Manganese		3.53 0.03-1.16
Molybdenum	43	15-175
Selenium	49	32-333
Strontium	102	47-346
Vanadium		8.4 0.1-3.2
	F	
Zinc	443	63-688
Zinc	Results in mg/g creatining	
	Results in mg/g creatining	ne
Element	Results in mg/g creatinin	ne Reference Range
Element Calcium	Results in mg/g creatining Reference Range	Reference Range

Element R	eference R	ange	TMPL	Reference Range
Lead	0.7			<= 1.4
Mercury	<dl></dl>			<= 2.19
Aluminum	16.2			<= 22.3
Antimony	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.149</td></dl<>			<= 0.149
Arsenic	37			<= 50
Barium	0.7			<= 6.7
Bismuth	<dl></dl>			<= 2.28
Cadmium	0.35			<= 0.64
Cesium	4.9			<= 10.5
Gadolinium	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.019</td></dl<>			<= 0.019
Gallium	0.011			<= 0.028
Nickel	4.	.61		<= 3.88
Niobium	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.084</td></dl<>			<= 0.084
Platinum	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.033</td></dl<>			<= 0.033
Rubidium	(2,372		<= 2,263
Thallium	0.229			<= 0.298
Thorium	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 4.189</td></dl<>			<= 4.189
Tin	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 2.04</td></dl<>			<= 2.04
Tungsten	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.211</td></dl<>			<= 0.211
Uranium	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td><= 0.026</td></dl<>			<= 0.026

Element	Reference Range	Reference	
Chromium	6.2	0.6-9.4	
Cobalt	0.12	0.01-2.60	
Copper	8.9	4.0-11.4	
Iron	55	5-64	
Lithium	19	9-129	
Manganese		2.93 0.03-1.16	
Molybdenum	24	15-175	
Selenium	52	32-333	
Strontium	115	47-346	
Vanadium		12.1 0.1-3.2	
Zinc	595	63-688	
Element	Results in mg/g creating	nine Reference Range	
Calcium	115	37-313	
Magnesium	82	41-267	
Potassium	4,425	759-4,653	
Sulfur	442	367-1,328	
		ion	

Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD



http://www.ahimsaportersumchaimd.com/#about

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Amendment to the General Obligation Bond Passthroughs

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 10:35:00 AM

From: Janey Youngblom < jyoungblom1@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 11:46 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org> **Subject:** Amendment to the General Obligation Bond Passthroughs

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To whom it may concern,

In the new amendment to the General Obligation Bond Passthroughs regarding "Banking", it states the following: "effective January 1, 2021, the landlord can no longer "bank" a general obligation bond passthrough that was not imposed for an unlimited period of time. Instead, general obligation bond passthroughs will be limited to only those tax bills issued within the three year period prior to the year in which the passthrough is imposed."

I am writing to request serious consideration by your Board members of delaying the enforcement of this new amendment from January 1, 2021 to the following year, or for as many months as the temporary rent freeze will ultimately apply. Due to the current moratorium on rent increases, landlords were/will NOT be able to exercise their last opportunity to apply their banked General Obligation Bond Passthroughs if their anniversary dates fell/fall within the moratorium period. With the statement that "The tenant is not responsible for any retroactive payments for the period during the temporary rent freeze", mom and pop landlords are especially hard hit during the rent freeze because they live on such a thin margin of survivability that relies heavily on rental income. While federal, state, and local assistance has been provided for renters, big businesses, and millionaires/billionaires, small time landlords have had no assistance or moratoriums working in their favor to help them survive this pandemic. Some small landlords are at their breaking point, and even a relatively small gesture as requested here would be helpful.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

-Janey Youngblom

Dear Corrupt City/State Leaders,

A curse has been cast upon each of you city leaders who have allowed the evil/filth to run your cities. You wouldn't let your neighborhood burn so why do you allow/permit this lawlessness to occur against innocent people; such a bunch of hypocrites. Be safe because evil surrounds your hearts by allowing the disgusting filth to destroy the good, decent people of your city. You are such race baitors and racists, and this is coming from a black man. Leave us alone; we can handle ourselves. People can see through your lies. You are just a bunch of self-righteous cowards.

God Bless America and everyone who protects us on a daily basis, unlike yourselves. You're just vultures and we don't need your help. You only appeal to the ignorant, uneducated who can't see through your evil and immoral ways. It's like the blind leading the blind.

It is disgusting that you treat the criminals who prey on innocent victims with the same rights. You should all be locked up for condoning/encouraging illegal activity. Along with the national media, who are also screwing us, why should we listen to moral degenerates who prey on hurting innocent folks at any selfish cost.

Again, God Bless America, but not you because you are godless souls with evil hearts. 1 John3:4-everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. Good luck at the gates of hell.

Sincerely, a very fed up citizen of your once great city/state.....



BOS-11

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Congestion Pricing = Empty "Donut Hole" Downtown

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 10:07:00 AM

Attachments: einstein-insanity-quote.png

From: Jamey Frank < jameyfrank@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 8:01 PM

Cc: Temprano, Tom (BOS) <tom.temprano@sfgov.org>

Subject: Congestion Pricing = Empty "Donut Hole" Downtown

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To: congestion-pricing@sfcta.org

Dear project team,

In cities where congestion pricing is implemented they have GREAT public transportation in Europe and New York City. I never need to rent a car in Europe.

But San Francisco and California does not and never has in the 31 years I've lived here. Transit transfers are painful and take forever. Muni is so unreliable, and now with additional transfers required, the metro shut down yet again, masks not enforced, and only a 3 foot distancing rule, very few people are willing or comfortable to ride transit. Uber/Lyft have taken up the slack and cycling is barely 3% despite **billions** spent on road redesign to favor cycling at the expense of drivers.

If every time I had to commute out of the city I'd pay \$12 toll each way, I'd simply drive around farther through neighborhoods not affected. I would have to cease my volunteering with SFPD ALERT headquartered in the Mission. I would do all my Costco shopping and other business down the peninsula. And no more taking my disable parents to North Beach or Dogpatch restaurants. Downtown will become like other cities, a lifeless empty "Donut Hole."


Partnering with Uber Pool/Lyft Line as feeders to backbone transit is a more realistic and workable idea without destroying what little business is left Downtown and in the Mission.

Authoritarian transportation policy isn't working. Insanity is doing the same thing over and over

and expecting a different result. This is why people lost their minds and voted for Trump.

Sincerely,

-- Jamey Frank, San Francisco



To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Please review Univ of Illinois back to school success

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:43:00 AM

----Original Message-----

From: Mariclare D Ballard <marcyballard@me.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 10:25 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS)

<norman.yee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Please review Univ of Illinois back to school success

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please review this program At U if I

testing of students 2X week

Faculty 1Xweek

They test, track and trace and isolate students on campus.

Worth looking at. The Republicans are going to point to all the blue cities Please exert leadership for our children and so we have something to make us proud.

Thank you,

M. Ballard

Sent from my iPad

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Keep Us Connected 2020 (2).pdf
Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:43:00 AM
Attachments: Keep Us Connected 2020 (2).pdf

From: Scott-Stephen Aiu <mail.aiusf@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 6:44 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

<aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>

Subject: Keep Us Connected 2020 (2).pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good Day Mayor Breed and Supervisor Peskin:

The attachment below is regarding the critical urgency, especially in this pandemic, to help San Francisco low-income seniors have basic Internet access. I would go to the Main Library daily to use their computers, but after the City shut-down, became anxious and felt isolated.

I am a very grateful client of one of the organizations participating in this coalition, Community Tech Network. They saved my life, as I am now able to pay my monthly bills online, as well as video conference with my medical providers - one of the most important aspects of growing older.

Recent focus has been on closing the Digital Divide for students of color returning to school with distance/remote learning, which is finally being addressed and good policy. For poor, single seniors living on a fixed income such as myself, I am hoping this email will bring greater awareness to a highly essential and important issue.

Thank you in advance for your time and kind consideration.

Scott-Stephen Aiu (District 3 resident for over 23 years) 1499 California St #412 Lower Nob Hill, SF



2020 Campaign to Bridge the Growing Digital Divide in SF

BACKGROUND: San Francisco has the highest proportion of seniors and adults with disabilities in California. Of those 75 and older, 36% live alone and are facing health and other mobility problems. COVID-19 "stay at home" orders have left many older adults, people with disabilities, and those with compromised health are virtually trapped in their homes. With libraries, and senior and community centers closed, they are unable to participate in regular activities or access essential services. Their situation is further aggravated by the fact that more than 50 percent lack home internet access, along with the devices, digital literacy, and support they need to participate in the digital world. All of this has led to an increase in social isolation and loneliness, both of which lead directly to poor health and wellness outcomes.

PROBLEM: COVID-19 has revealed the true extent of the digital divide and intensified its impact on vulnerable populations. While San Francisco is a world leader in technological innovation and the City has committed millions to internal tech needs, 100,000 people, including a sizeable segment of its older adults and residents living with a disability, remain disconnected from the digital world! Simply put, too many people don't have reliable internet access, a device, or the digital literacy and support they need to get information, have routine online medical visits, pay bills and taxes, connect meaningfully with family and friends, or participate in any activities made available through the internet.

SOLUTION: Keep seniors and people with disabilities in San Francisco connected by:

- Expanding access to affordable broadband internet
- Expanding access to free & low-cost devices
- Expanding training and technical support

Connected living contributes to living longer and healthier lives. Computer training & internet access won't end isolation but they provide a vital link to family, friends, social services, medical services, religious communities, and virtual programming at senior centers like exercise classes and online social activities. Paired with assistive technologies, digital access can help SF residents overcome a vast range of physical and mental disabilities in their own homes and communities, safely, while staying connected to the rest of the world.













Budget Proposal:

We are asking for \$968,000 to strengthen and expand SF Connected beyond current baseline funding to close the Digital Divide and prevent its adverse impacts on our more vulnerable populations. The **2020 Keep Us Connected Campaign** builds on the success of the original program and funds items needed now more than ever.

Broadband Internet Access

\$ 120,000

• Help individuals access existing ISP programs and increase the number of partnerships with non-profits for reduced price access.

Digital Equipment

\$ 220,000

• Increase the available number of free and affordable devices available for purchase and for loan.

Staff - Trainers

Training with Digital Coaches and Tutors

\$ 325,000

Provide more virtual one-on-one training and classes; hire more computer trainers, tutors, and volunteer coordinators, a majority of whom could be seniors and adults with disabilities, providing employment opportunities and supporting peer learning

Bi-lingual & Disability Savvy Computer Trainers and Tutors

\$ 150,000

Grow the number of bi-lingual trainers and tutors and those experienced with assistive technology to better reach those with loss of vision, hearing, dexterity or other disabilities;

Staff - In-take and Coordination

\$ 108,000

• Raise resources and better coordinate efforts to close the digital divide in San Francisco.

Internet and Equipment Setup and Technical Assistance

\$ 10,000

• Offer assistance to individuals to use and maintain their own equipment including initial set up, through online tech support, repair and loaner programs, on-line help events in multiple languages.

Train the trainer material and expanded outreach material

Training and Outreach Material

\$ 10,000

Other Program Costs (background checks, etc.)

\$ 2,000

Program Evaluation

\$ 23,000

• Conduct an evaluation of program outcomes; different intervention models; and user experiences.

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Safety of hairstyling salons

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:15:00 AM

Attachments: Safety Analysis for Inside Versus Outside Salon Operations.docx

Scientific Analysis of the Safety of Hairstying Salons and Barbershops.docx

From: Mark Gottlieb <mark.gottlieb2010@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 2:57 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Safety of hairstyling salons

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Boardmember Yee,

I am a retired scientist living in Berkeley, California advocating for the reopening of hairstyling salons and barbershops, and for their inside operation. I have written two analyses addressing these concerns focusing on an assessment of the safety of each, which are attached for your review. Please give this matter your thoughtful attention as President of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Gottlieb Independent Researcher

SAFETY ANALYSIS OF INSIDE VERSUS OUTSIDE OPERATIONS OF HAIRSTYLING SALONS AND BARBERSHOPS DURING THE PANDEMIC

I would like to address the recent decision of the Public Health Departments of Los Angeles and San Francisco regarding the operation of hairstyling salons and barbershops. They have determined that hairstyling salons and barbershops can be reopened as-long-as they conduct their business outside. I would like to point out that based upon this analysis and my earlier analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops, the work done by hairstyling salons and barbershops is MUCH SAFER when it is done inside rather than outside.

This is so because working outside the clients are exposed to an environment that is less clean, especially since some of the chemical cleaners cannot be used outside of the salons and barbershops, the equipment and tools used by the hairstylists and barbers cannot be as readily cleaned, and running extension cords for electrical equipment may present a tripping hazard for the hairstylists, barbers, and members of the public who walk by the working area on the sidewalk.

Similarly, working outside facemasks will become dirtier more quickly limiting their usefulness, and members of the public may not socially distance themselves from the work area and may not be wearing facemasks, creating a risk of exposure to the hairstylists, barbers, and their clients. Some members of the public may be walking their dogs by the outside work area which adds to the uncleanliness of the outside work environment.

Members of the public walking outside by the work area near the hairstylists and barbers cannot be tested to determine if they have symptoms of Covid-19, while for work inside the salons and barbershops they would not be allowed to enter if they are symptomatic of Covid-19. Also, the number of individuals in the salons and barbershops can be limited while this may not be possible with members of the public walking by outside work areas.

The business activities of the salons and barbershops will be limited, in that hair coloring cannot be done because the chemicals used by them cannot be used outside of the salons and barbershops. Likewise, wind, rain, and temperatures that are too hot or too cold will curtail the operations of salons and barbershops that are required to do their business outside. Disposing of the hair that is cut that has fallen on the sidewalk will be more difficult resulting in possible safety and health hazards.

None of these restrictions apply to work done inside of the salons and barbershops. From my earlier analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops, which is included in this email communication, the safety of clients inside of them is greatly enhanced because of their meticulous safety practices. They are found to be more than 100,000 times as safe as a simple analysis of the probability of catching Covid-19 would indicate as determined by my earlier analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops, making their work much safer inside than outside. This is so, because

working outside the salons or barbershops, even with the precautions that are taken, is not likely to be much safer for hairstylists, barbers, and their clients than for members of the public at large during the pandemic for the reasons I have indicated above.

While the policy of requiring work outside during the pandemic may be appropriate for restaurants, it is inappropriate to apply it to salons and barbershops as a blanket rule. Salons and barbershops are very different from restaurants from the standpoint of their safe operation during the pandemic as my comments above indicate, and hairstyling salons and barbershops should not be constrained to follow the same practices mandated for restaurants by government agencies.

Thank you for your willingness to read this analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops for operating inside rather than outside. As mentioned above, I have included my earlier analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops for your convenience in this email communication for you. Please let me know if I can clarify anything for you in this email or in either of my analyses.

I hope my concerns and the points I raise in this email and in my earlier analysis of the safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops lead you to advocate for allowing hairstylists and barbers to work inside of their salons and barbershops.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Gottlieb Independent Researcher Berkeley, California This analysis shows that hairstyling salons and barbershops are more than 100,000 times safer than would be expected from a simple analysis of the probability of a client catching Covid19 on their premises if they did not take the protective measures they do. This underscores the extremely effective measures taken by them to protect members of the public.

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE ROUTE THIS EMAIL TO PEOPLE ACTIVELY ADVOCATING FOR THE REOPENING OF HAIRSTYLING SALONS AND BARBERSHOPS IN CALIFORNIA AND THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES.

I am a retired scientist living in Berkeley, California, and the dear friend of a hairstylist who is adversely impacted by public policies that have been adopted in response to the pandemic. I am writing to you to demonstrate by-the-use of current statistics about the pandemic and routine probability calculations the very-high degree of safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops for members of the public. I hope that this analysis will be helpful to you in your efforts to get them reopened.

I disagree with the common knowledge that it is not safe for opening hair salons and barbershops at this time, which I believe is based on a misapplication of scientific findings concerning the health effects of the pandemic. In the text of a recent petition to reopen hairstyling salons, it stated that out of 139 clients who visited a hairstyling salon in the state of Missouri no one tested positive for Covid19 even though the hairstyling salon had two hairstylists that tested positive for Covid19.

Looking at these numbers from the standpoint of probability theory, I found an interesting result that leads me to my conclusion about the very-high degree of safety of hairstyling salons and barbershops. From recent statistics on Worldometer for Covid19 in the United States, it is reported that there have been 4,371,839 active cases of Covid19 in the United States with 54,219,575 tests in the United States. From these numbers, I calculate that the probability of a test indicating an active case of Covid19 in the United States is 0.0806, the number of active cases divided by the number of tests.

Therefore, the probability of an active case of Covid19 not occurring is 1 - 0.0806 or 0.9194. Since 139 clients were exposed to an environment where Covid19 was present, it would be expected that (0.0806)x139 = 11.2034 clients would become infected with Covid19, (i.e. the probability of an active case of Covid19 occurring times the number of people exposed to someone with Covid19). In other words, it would be expected that approximately 11 clients would be infected with Covid19 from the group of 139 people who visited the hairstyling salon. The probability of none of them being infected with Covid19, which was the case, is $(0.9194)^{139} = 0.000008455$, $(0.9194)^{139} = 0.000008455$, $(0.9194)^{139} = 0.000008455$, or less than 1 in 100,000.

This probability, the probability of less than 1 in 100,000 of no one being infected with Covid19 from a group of 139 people, is more than 9,500 times lower than the probability of 0.0806 for an individual to be infected with Covid19 in the United States. Since not

one of the 139 people who went to the Hairstyling Salon was infected with Covid19, which defies this very low probability calculated for no one being infected with Covid19, it shows that the protective measures that were taken in the hairstyling salon worked extremely well. This analysis shows that hairstyling salons and barbershops are among the safest places to be in the United States during the pandemic and are much safer than the public places that members of the public can now visit.

It should be noted that hairstylists, who are licensed cosmetologists, and licensed barbers receive extensive training for 1600 hours for cosmetologists and 1500 hours for barbers in maintaining clean, safe, sanitized, and disinfected tools and workspaces. Restaurant workers are not required to have such training. Likewise, it is uncertain if the people who process and handle the food that is delivered to the restaurants have had such training. Yet, restaurants in the United States, and-in-particular California have been open for takeout and outside dining while hairstyling salons and barbershops in many locales in the United States, and notably California have not been allowed to open.

Just recently the CDC, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the bedrock of scientific discourse on Covid19, ruled that schools could reopen in the Fall and children could return to their classes. If attending school is judged to be safe for children who may not always practice good social distancing or the wearing of face masks, why is the opening of hairstyling salons and barbershops not allowed, especially; in light of the probabilities I calculated above indicating the great unlikelihood of contracting Covid19 from being present in them?

Lastly, it should be noted that there is considerable concern about the number and severity of cases of mental illness arising from the social distancing and isolation policies enacted in response to the pandemic. I believe that hairstyling salons and barbershops are beneficial for the mental health of members of the public, in that the caring attention hairstylists and barbers provide in an amiable environment is uplifting, as is looking good with one's hair styled in an attractive and complementary way. Likewise, the opportunity to return to work would be very uplifting and helpful to hairstylists and barbers who are currently under financial and emotional distress, as a result of policies being inappropriately applied to them that have been enacted in response to the pandemic.

I hope this analysis is helpful to you in your efforts to advocate for the reopening of hairstyling salons in California and throughout the United States. Please use it as you see fit. I am available to discuss my analysis and its implications with any interested parties.

I wish you every success in your efforts to advocate for the reopening of hairstyling salons and barbershops in California and throughout the United States.

Sincerely yours, Mark Gottlieb From: Katie Gray

To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides

Subject: REOPEN SAN FRANCISCO TATTOO SHOPS

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 11:27:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Dear Supervisor Ahsha Safai~

My name is Katie Gray + I am a 22 year long resident of San Francisco whom is currently in the process of opening my own Tattoo Studio in district 11. I arrived here alone at the age of 15 to attend the College Art Experience for the Academy Of Art + went through to complete my MFA at the California College of the Arts. I am one of the few left, willing to fight to keep creativity alive in this city. A city that feels hellbent on tearing at our communities last thread.

On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shuttered our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. We have been closed since and it has devastated me financially. I have lost my housing, my healthcare + my job during this time + have had to fight every single day to try and stay afloat. I put the last bit of my savings into my dream of business ownership, believing that there was no humane way our local + state governments would force us to stay closed as long as we have. I had faith that the city of San Francisco would put value in its working class + small business + would want to protect them + their families from forced poverty. I hate to inform you, but forced poverty does not slow the spread of coronavirus. The 'science' that has been used to determine tattooing as unsafe has unfairly stigmatized our practice. It is righteously unfair to a community of people trained in keeping their clients + practitioners safe. We are diligent in our annual trainings and hold ourselves to a high standard. Unfortunately, we have not been given an opportunity to recoup our losses since March... while services such as malls, retail etc with no training have been allowed to reopen. During this time, I have had to make choices on rather I eat, or pay rent. I have not had the luxury of 'working from home,' or 'sheltering in place,' those both to me Supervisor Safai, are privileged acts.

It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

- Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended periods of time
- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and salespeople wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients
- Indoor malls are reopening prior to tattooing
- Nancy Pelosi got her hair done inside a salon sans mask
- Mayor London Breed has used the SFPD gym since the start of SIP

Most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops

operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners/piercers/microbladers have received unemployment benefits. I was denied from the Mayors Artist grant three times with a generic response that indicated that they 'don't give grants to creatives such as ballon makers.' It is an insult to injury that our community suffers without recognition. A community that throughout the decades, has been vital to the vibrance + history of San Francisco.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because we are not only trained annually in OSHA standard BBP (blood borne pathogen) control + cleanliness, but have the ability to work one on one with clients and/or set our shops with appropriate social distancing. We are never practicing without gloves, mask + other PPE.

Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully,

Katie Gray
The Helm
www.katiegray.info
IG: @____katie.gray
blu.collar.art@gmail.com
The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

From: <u>Idexa Stern</u>

To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS)

Cc: BOS-Supervisors; bos-legistative aides@sfgov.org

Subject: Please reopen San Francisco Tattoo Shops in September!

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:13:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Mr. Mandelman,

My name is Idexa Stern. I work at and own Black & Blue Tattoo in District 8. On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shut down our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to control the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients.

We have been closed since then and it has devastated me financially. I have since had to pay for the shop rent. My landlord has send me bills for full rent every month, to a point were I found it necessary to negotiate, so it wouldn't be all due, the day we open. I have robbed my IRA and spend the funds, I had saved for retirement. I have applied for the PPP loan numerous times, only to be told I am not eligible, after having my business for 28 years and having several employees. I did finally receive an unforgivable loan, to keep paying bills. I do receive unemployment, which is at this point about 1/20 of what I make when my shop is open. I also have spend 10K on an air filtration system for my business and now we have a Carbon and HEPA system that insures better airflow and cleaner air then people use, who work outside.

It seems wrong that although we have been performing our service safely, with PPE, like disposable gloves, the use of aprons and protective sleeves and masks, and now even face shields, a yearly blood borne Pathogens course for all artists, yet we have not received the opportunity to open and recoup our steep loss. It seems like an oversight that we have remained closed, while in San Francisco currently:

• Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended

periods of time

- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and salespeople wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients
- (any or all of these points)

but most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners have received unemployment benefits.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because we are safer, cleaner, more careful, have training on how to not cross contaminate and are familiar with how to use Personal Protective Equipment. IN MY CASE, EVEN HAVE AIR FILTRATION.

Please support TATTOO and BODY ART shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, IDEXA STERN

The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

Idexa Stern owner and artist at

Black & Blue Tattoo

381 Guerrero St. San Francisco, CA 94103 w (415) 626-0770 c (415) 516-1974

http://www.blackandbluetattoo.com

From: <u>Studio Kazoku</u>

To: Preston, Dean (BOS); Snyder, Jen (BOS); Yu, Avery (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS)

Cc: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>; <u>BOS-Legislative Aides</u>

Subject: REOPEN SF TATTOO SHOPS

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 3:55:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Supervisor Dean Preston:

I am writing to ask that you and the Board of Supervisors support the safe reopening of Tattoo and Body Art Shops and help ensure the Mayor follows through in reopening our businesses by the end of September.

My name is Jill "Horiyuki" Bonny . I have been tattooing professionally for 25 years and own Studio Kazoku in the Haight Ashbury. I was titled "Horiyuki" in 2008 by Master Horiyoshi III of Yokohama and specialize in Japanese-style tattooing. I have been organizing the Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco reopening efforts and advocating for tattooing at the City and State level throughout the pandemic.

My shop is located in District 5 and has been closed in response to the City's stay at home orders since March 17 in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. Our forced closure has devasted me and my workers financially. Two of my team have left San Francisco out of financial despair, while another has been supporting himself by traveling to Texas to legally work. My family is sinking in to debt trying to stay afloat with only one income. I have two young children and have not qualified for outside support by the federal government, minus a stimulus check for \$1200 which may constitute a month's worth of groceries.

It is outrageous that we are expected to pay our bills and rent with no financial assistance from the office that is forcing our closure and no solid

expectation of when we will reopen. The city has offered us a third projected approximate reopen date, "the end of September". This projected reopen date is contingent on cases decreasing between now and then. With Labor Day coming it is hard to imagine that we will get our chance and feels like another empty promise. Personal Services has become San Francisco's "Forgotten Sector" and it appears the City has no vested interest in keeping our registered small businesses alive.

It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

- Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended periods of time
- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and sales people wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational working oftentimes on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients

Most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19. Therefore, **keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease**. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases. Dr. Aragon has stated he believes that cases have surged due to people's individual social behaviors and has publicly stated he believes we are a low risk activity and more causal research would prove **we are not responsible for the spread of COVID 19.**

Tattoo and Body Art has already cooperated with the San Francisco Department of Public Health and Office of Economic Workforce Development in the writing and approving of updated guidance that will make certain our shops can operate safely through the COVID-19 pandemic. Tattoo shops are already successfully stemming the spread of AIDS, Hepatitis C and MRSA and are confident that our training and education has prepared us to reopen safely and interpret these guidelines to fit each of our unique spaces.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. There is no business model that supports a small business weathering over 6 months of closure, full bill and rent accountability and an unknown expectation of the future for fear of more forced closure.

Sharky Laguana, President of the Small Business Commission, has stated that over 50% of the city's economy is based on small business and if the small businesses collapse it will take the rest of the economy down with it.

Not all tattoo shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all individual artists have received unemployment benefits. We don't have teams of lawyers and accountants advising us to grab grants and loans the moment they are released. We are artists learning business organization as we go, but we deserve to survive this terrible mess and continue to enrich what's left of the crumbling creative and art culture San Francisco has cultivated over the last century.

Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jill "Horiyuki" Bonny

Studio Kazoku 1915 Page St.

www.studiokazokutattoo.com

The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

From: <u>Svetoslav Svetoslavov</u>

To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Reopen SF Tattoo Shops; Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

Subject: Reopen SF Tattoo Shops

Date: Friday, September 4, 2020 12:42:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted

To Supervisor Aaron Peskin:

My name is Svetoslav Svetoslavov. I work at and own Dream Masters Custom Tattoos and Inktrek Tattoo Supplies in District (#3). On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shuttered our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. We have been closed since and it has devastated me financially. I have not just one business but two businesses that I am barely keeping afloat because of this pandemic. Not only do I own two businesses, but I also have a wife and two children who depend on the success of myself and my companies in order to eat, live, sleep, and survive. My second-born child spent more than the first year of his life in the hospital, so not only am I actively keeping him from ending back there, but am also expected to pay thousands of dollars back to the hospital all while keeping my businesses closed to the public. This makes it impossible to receive any income or pay any bills. It feels unfair that although we can perform our service safely while both our clients and ourselves wear masks yet we have not received the opportunity to open and recoup our steep financial loss.

It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended periods of time

Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers

and salespeople wear masks

- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients

but most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners/piercers/microbladers have received unemployment benefits. Neither myself nor any of my employees have been approved for any of these financial aid options.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because of our continued dedication to cleanliness, safety, and blood-borne pathogen training. Our shop is outfitted with UV sterilization lighting for full air and surface sanitation. There are only two artists who work at our shop at any given time, one on our first floor and the other on the second floor of our shop, so we continue to have smaller amounts of people in our space than any other business that is currently operating during this pandemic. We work only by appointment and are more equipped than any other business that is currently open to trace contact and prevent contamination. Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Svetloslav Svetoslavov Dream Masters Custom Tattoos, Inktrek Tattoo Supply 228 Columbus Ave, San Francisco CA 94133 The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

Svetlyo (Svetoslav Svetoslavov), owner



https://www.dream-masters.com svetlyo@dream-masters.com 228 Columbus Ave, San Francisco CA 94133 work: (415)277-7204



Inktrek LLC San Francisco Tattoo Supply Company

https://www.inktrek.com info@inktrek.com 228 Columbus Ave, San Francisco CA 94133 work: (415)277-7204 From: Holly Ellis

To: <u>PrestonStaff (BOS)</u>

Cc: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>; <u>BOS-Legislative Aides</u>

Subject: REOPEN TATTOO SHOPS!!

Date: Friday, September 4, 2020 12:57:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Supervisor Preston:

My name is Holly Ellis. I work at/own Idle Hand Tattoo in District 5. On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shuttered our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. We have been closed since and it has devastated me financially in the present and when I am finally able to reopen I will have lost at least half of my staff and the possibility of reovering from this will be bleak. The amount of unemployment has not been enough to sustain the expensive SF rent they have to pay and some are so far in debt they see no way out other than to leave. On top of that, other counties and states are allowing tattooing so my contractors can go somewhere else to work, as well as our clients can drive to other counties to get tattooed. It feels unfair that although we can perform our service safely while both our clients and ourselves wear masks yet we have not received the opportunity to open and recoup our steep financial loss. It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

- Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended periods of time
- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and salespeople wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services. As well as being allowed to have licensed tattooers operating in their facilities. How is that fair AT ALL or even make any sense??!!
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients

but most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners/piercers/microbladers have received unemployment benefits. This will effect me directly when trying to reopen and restaff as well as rebuild our clientele. You are letting a whole culture perish that has contributed so much to the city of San Francisco for the last century.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because you are allowing other people to operate that do not even come close to the standards of safety that we have already in place in our shops. And because you are already allowing licensed tattooers operate under med spas it is UNBELIEVABLE that you won't allow tattoo shops to open. THIS MAKES NO SENSE. Not to mention the fact that when my shop was open and operating we brought a lot of business to the neighborhood restaurants and shops. When we held events the businesses around us also benefited. Of course we won't be operating like that again for a long time but the fact will still be that by allowing us to reopen the rest of the neighborhood also benefits.

Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Holly Ellis Idle Hand Tattoo 575 Haight St <u>www.idlehandsf.com</u>

The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

--

<u>Idle Hand Tattoo</u> (415)552-4353

From: Evan Weidner

To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Koeppel, Geri (BOS)

Cc: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; reopensftattooshops@gmail.com

Subject: Allow Tattoo Shops to Re-open - I am about to loose my apartment

Date: Saturday, September 5, 2020 9:37:11 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Aaron Peskin, and all attached recipients of this email:

My name is Evan Weidner. I work at LET IT BLEED TATTOO (district #3). On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shuttered our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. We have been closed since and it has devastated me financially, as I have been cut off from the Heros act and am unable to pay rent or afford major bills. I am also currently recovering from a major knee surgery that I had done in June and now my medical debt is getting completely out of control as well, as I am forced to not work and deffer my rent further and further. It feels unfair that although we can perform our service safely while both our clients and ourselves wear masks, that yet we have not received the opportunity to open and recoup our steep financial loss. With also zero answers from our city council or Mayor London Breed, whom has not addressed how low income artists are supppose to survive this at all.

It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

- Unmasked people eat and drink outside together for extended periods of time
- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and salespeople wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly

- close proximity to their clients
- Outdoor bars have people drinking close together and not obeying orders. How is this sanitary? but my professional knowledge of pathogens not?

most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners/piercers/microbladers have received unemployment benefits. I have already gone over how this has directly effected myself, and thousands of others here in the city that fall into the same catagory as I do.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because for all listed reasons, there is absolutely no way the city can justify the reopening of all other business that have been aloud to reopen but we are shut out?

Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Evan Weidner - Artist LET IT BLEED TATTOO 1124 Polk St. SF. CA 818.292.3554 - cell evan.weidner@gmail.com

The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

From: <u>Black Serum Tattoo</u>

To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS)

Cc: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>; <u>BOS-Legislative Aides</u>

Subject: Reopen SF Tattoo Shops

Date: Sunday, September 6, 2020 6:01:57 PM
Attachments: Letter for reopening-2020.docx.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Dear Supervisor Raphael Mandelman,

Please find attached my letter for consideration regarding the reopening of tattoo shops in San Francisco this coming end of September.

This is the third reopening date we have been given this year and it must hold up this time. Please help support us in making sure that we are guaranteed a solid reopening date. It is crucial to the survival of our business and livelihoods.

Respectfully, Brücius von Xylander owner of Black Serum, Inc.



310 Valencia St.
San Francisco CA 94103

415 909-9437 | blackserum.com

To Supervisor Rafael Mandelman:

My name is Brucius Xylander. I work at/own Black Serum Tattoo in Mission District. On March 17, 2020, in response to the City's stay at home orders, we all shuttered our businesses in support of Mayor Breed's efforts to stem the spread of the COVID-19 virus and ensure the safety and health of our practitioners and clients. We have been closed since and it has devastated me financially. I have accumulated thousands of dollars in rent fees and other non-negotiable bills I have not been able to pay because I cannot work. It feels unfair that although we can perform our service safely while both our clients and ourselves wear masks we have not yet received the opportunity to open and recoup our steep financial loss. It feels like an oversight that we have remained closed while in San Francisco currently:

- Unmasked people eat/drink outside together for extended periods of time
- Retail stores continue to operate indoors while both customers and salespeople wear masks
- Med Spas are fully operational and oftentimes working on unmasked clients performing non-medical, personal services
- Chiropractors and acupuncturists work safely indoors in similarly close proximity to their clients

But most importantly, there is no data supporting the notion that tattoo and body art shops operating with precautions are spreading COVID-19, therefore keeping us closed does not stem the spread of the disease. Our peers around the country, and the world, have been open for months and have not been traced as the source of outbreaks or clusters, even in communities experiencing surges of cases.

The longer we are forced to stay closed the more difficult it will be to manage the debt we are experiencing. Not all shop owners have qualified for PPP loans and not all tattooers or body art practitioners/piercers/microbladers have received unemployment benefits. I personally have been struggling to receive unemployment benefits since March, and still have no cooperation from the EDD. They continue to say they will escalate my case, but I still have not received any form of aid and I am running out of savings and having to dip into my retirement fund.

I believe we deserve to lawfully reopen because of our cleanliness, safety, and blood-borne pathogen training, as well as being able to maintain a small number of people in the space. We are also already set up for possible contact tracing through appointment info.

Please support tattooing and body art shops in your district and in San Francisco and help make sure that we reopen in September as Mayor Breed is pledging to us. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Brucius Xylander
Black Serum Inc.
310 Valencia Street
The Unified Tattoo and Body Art Shops of San Francisco

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: Hair Salons

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:30:00 PM

From: Levitt Bonnie
 sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 12:01 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Hair Salons

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed and all of the SF Supervisors:

I write to express my dismay that San Francisco has not yet given hair salons permission to reopen for indoor services. I find it illogical that I can go to the dentist for a routine cleaning, obviously without my mask on, and that is considered safe assuming the dental practice and I follow safety procedures. Those same safety procedures can be followed in a hair salon (as we saw when Rep. Pelosi went to a salon with a mask to get her hair done). Why is this segment of the business community unable to open for business? In my opinion, so long as temperature checks, distancing, masking and other safety procedures are followed, the COVID-19 risk is as low or lower than the in-office routine dental procedure where the patient has her or his mouth wide open.

Although it's not a scientific observation, I have seen with my own eyes people getting clandestine haircuts in salons, garages, and private homes. Let's get these hair stylists back to work legitimately, please!

I hope you will reopen indoor hair salons <u>immediately</u> unless you can provide an evidence-based rationale for keeping them closed.

Sincerely yours,

Bonnie Levitt 50 Parker Avenue San Francisco, CA 94118

brklevitt@comcast.net

Cell: 415 385-0253

Hello everyone!

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2020 SEP - 1 PM 3: 07

My name is Patricia Rinaldo and I reside at 640 Post Street, Apartment 604, a place I love and have and have called home for many years.

In the past 12 months, I've been attacked three times by a homeless man walking the streets of downtown San Francisco and lower Nob Hill. Each time, I could have been killed. I'm a spiritual person and each time I raised my hand and screamed, "Help me God! Please help me dear God." With each attack, my life has been saved and how grateful I am to be alive and well and with you today.

One year ago, as I was emptying my morning trash at 8 a.m., a homeless man was on my hallway, following me to my apartment. I then started screaming back, "Help me dear God. Please help me!" He turned and ran away. My life was spared.

Six months ago, as I was walking home from my corner store at 600 Post Street, a homeless man began following me, screaming "Look at you! Look at you!" I ran back to the store and cried out to the owner, "Sammy, help me. This man could kill me!" He immediately called the police, ran after the man and hold him to "Get out! Go! Go! And don't come back here!" Again, my life was spared.

On Saturday, February 29th at 9 a.m., as I was out for my morning walk, a homeless man came up to me and began pointing to my head, my arms, my legs, kicking and screaming. I ran home and immediately called the San Francisco Police Department. On each occasion, I was treated with the greatest amount of dignity, respect and kindness, as though I were royalty and <u>the most important person in the world.</u> This department has the reputation of being one of the

finest in the country – and the world – and I stand today as a personal witness to that fact. I know firsthand that this is absolutely true!

When Rev. Cecil Williams was alive, Glide Church had one of the most successful programs in the City – perhaps the world. He took them in and they had three requirements – they had to go through rehab, they had to work, and they had to attend church every day! St. Anthony's has taken over this program, but I stand before you today with my mission. Of course they need housing. They need rehab, and most importantly, they need to read the Bible out loud EVERY DAY. These can be donated by San Francisco's very wealthy business community.

I will do everything in my power to help solve this City crises. My parents retired to Salem, Oregon and at that time, homelessness was against the law. If you were homeless, you were given a broom and bucket and told to go out and clean the streets or you go to jail! It was one of the most beautiful cities in the entire United States, and perhaps the world. San Francisco used to have this reputation – but no longer. I had one policeman tell me in all cities across the United States today, homeless men and women are told, "You're going to get on a bus and go to San Francisco. You can sleep on the streets there." This must stop!

Let's all work together to bring back San Francisco to its beauty and charm.

My sincerest thanks for your time and unending dedication.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: The League urges you to support the emergency ordinance for #HotelsNotHospitalBeds

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:03:00 AM

----Original Message-----

From: Lindsey Hanson <glitterinyourgruel@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 9:59 AM

To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Mandelman,

Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Subject: The League urges you to support the emergency ordinance for #HotelsNotHospitalBeds

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisors Yee, Fewer, and Mandelman,

The League of Pissed Off Voters has endorsed each of you multiple times, and we're proud of how our members helped get you into office. We consider you allies in our effort to build a progressive governing majority. In these unprecedented times, there is nothing more progressive you can do than vote for the emergency ordinance to secure hotel rooms for San Francisco's most vulnerable. #HotelsNotHospitalBeds

We know you will soon be grappling with how to balance a brutal budget deficit, and we understand it's unclear how much we will be reimbursed for the cost of these hotel rooms. But it is clearly a wise investment to minimize the spread of the coronavirus in our most vulnerable populations. And the moral argument is much more important and unequivocal than any fiscal argument: don't let our unhoused needlessly neighbors die on our streets!

Most urgently,

The San Francisco League of Pissed Off Voters

P.S. The lack of oversight on this failure to care for our homeless neighbors is one more reason we call on you to create a homelessness commission.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Homeless blocking wheelchair paths

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 10:03:00 AM

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net> Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 5:38 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

<mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>

Cc: Heather Knight hknight@sfchronicle.com; Heiken, Emma (MYR) heiken, Emma (MYR) heiken (MYR)

Subject: Homeless blocking wheelchair paths

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attention: All Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed,

I have never been able to walk. At age 63, I found it too difficult to walk on crutches. So, now I use a mobility scooter. For years I have appeared before the board on crutches only to be ignored.

I am alerting this board and Mayor Breed through this email that I am having a navigation problem on my scooter.

Due to city government's approach to the homeless and blocking of sidewalk paths I find myself having to make what I claim are dangerous maneuvers into the streets at times.

If I continue to be ignored, I like Hastings School of the Law will use the courts and ADA to get your attention.

The sidewalks can and must be cleared of homeless. Now I am willing to work with you all but if you refuse to communicate with me I know it is because you are daring me to take legal action.

The photo attached is the latest (8/27/20) of many obstacles I have encountered. It caused me to go into the street. Yes, I could have confronted the person blocking my path, but quite frankly, I was not in the mood to be polite. And I am the champ of polite.

Finally, I am not waiting for any of you to respond. I will simply change course if you do understand my situation.

Allen Jones (415) 756-7733

jones-allen@att.net

Californiaclemency.org

The Only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: Feedback

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:12:00 AM

From: Vitaly Winter <mrvitalik@gmail.com> Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 11:44 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Feedback

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a citizen and HOA board president living in SOMA, I think I speak on behalf of everyone in SF when I say that we are tired with the filth and mismanagement of money and the inhumane treatment of homeless. Enough is enough and you can only make people so angry. Please consider the innovative and successful Community First Village in Austin, Tx and implementing it in SF. Your failed policies of hotel rooms and buying tents isn't working for obvious reasons. You all really should be ashamed of yourselves. The city streets are potholes, taxes are through the roofs, businesses and taxpayers are leaving, and thousands of people are incentivized to live in the streets. It's not acceptable and elections are just around the corner!

Please read this article in reference:

https://www.marinatimes.com/2020/08/is-saving-san-francisco-a-priority-for-politicians/?fbclid=IwAR0Q9YdM662Donlm6flh3KcXwohpZVkPYNUf1xELESnvl6rkpDjBqkD-hQ0

Vitaly Winter

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: Homeless Tents

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 5:01:00 PM

From: Karen Justis <karenjustis@gmail.com> **Sent:** Wednesday, September 2, 2020 1:33 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Kositsky, Jeff (DEM) <jeff.kositsky@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<abigail.rivamontemesa@sfgov.org>; Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>; Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfgov.org>

Subject: Homeless Tents

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear All,

A few days ago I excitedly got into my vehicle and headed over to my framer's shop. As I approached her wide alley, it was shocking to see all the tents lined up on the sidewalk. One right after another! It felt disconcerting to see yet another sidewalk in SOMA overtaken by the homeless, tents, and all their belongings. When I asked her what's going on, she replied that it's being "controlled", that police come by periodically to make sure the situation is "calm".

To pay high commercial rent and have to contend with this is beyond absurd. So is issuing and maintaining strict shelter-in-place mandates for all of us who pay high property taxes while the homeless folks are allowed free rein of the streets day and night to do whatever whenever, and the reduction in our property values. This is just not right!

Homelessness is not a monetary issue, rather, one of policy. So much money is being allotted and spent on this issue to no avail year after year, and the problem is getting worse. It's the fault of our governor, mayor who's in over her head, the board of supervisors, and other officials committed to bad policies. Drug and alcohol use and abuse have been decriminalized, and now it's legal for people to live on the streets. Leniency over tough lough is the norm and, as a consequence, San Francisco is starting to look and feel like Gotham.

Similar to the hair salon visit, I feel confident that Nancy Pelosi, Diane Feinstein, and Gavin Newsom for starters would never allow tents to be lined up on the sidewalks flanking their homes. (Further I've grown frustrated with the pushing of policies that keep our economy closed and our small businesses shut down.)

As long as I can remember, I've voted democratic; however, I do believe that the progressive liberal

left is just as destructive as the conservative right. I, like so many others, are in the middle and want what is fair and reasonable. Your policies, quite frankly, are not working as is evident by how many people are fleeing SF for safety and renewal due to the increase/influx of homeless people at your invitation.

I would love for the misguided policies to change. Barring that, I will be forced to join the exodus.

As a constituent, I do hope you read this. A response would be nice too!

Sincerely, Karen Justis From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Encampment on O"Farrell between Scott & Pierce

Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 8:17:00 AM

From: STEPHEN WALLEN <stephenews@comcast.net>

Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2020 5:18 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Encampment on O'Farrell between Scott & Pierce

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I have contacted 311.org, the administration at Gateway High School, and our representative on the Board of Supervisors, Dean Preston. The situation is deteriorating. This is an email from a fellow homeowner. Believe me, he is not an alarmist:

"Hi Endicotters,

Today a homeless man was using our front electrical outlet to charge his phone, and cooking something in a bottle, likely some kind of drug. When I told him to leave he was resistant, asking if it was my house, then insisting that the electricity wasn't something we paid for since it was outside. As I write this he is still outside our front gate sorting though his belongings.

As you're probably aware, the homeless encampment down the street has grown over the past few days, and the community has grown. I've observed drug activity in the past few days taking place, which doesn't make for a good harbinger of things to come. I know folks have called 311, and written Dean Preston. Sadly, none of these efforts have led to anything. I've also communicated with the school, simply to make them aware of the camp on their premises. Again, nothing has come from this correspondence.

Anyway, that's where things are, just wanted to give the update.

Be careful out there!"

My name is Stephen Wallen, and my address since 1983 is 1963 O'Farrell St. I am a homeowner and taxpayer. We need something done here.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: FW: Let"s go back to Weekly Street Cleaning - 21 days in a row of no sweeping makes for a dirty city.

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 3:51:23 PM
Attachments: 32715-OLA 017 08 Street Sweeping(1)-1.pdf

image001.png

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 11:59 AM **To:** BOS-Supervisors

Sos-supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: FW: Let's go back to Weekly Street Cleaning - 21 days in a row of no sweeping makes for a dirty city.

From: B C < llebpmacb@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 11:18 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) < board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Let's go back to Weekly Street Cleaning - 21 days in a row of no sweeping makes for a dirty city.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Board of Supervisors,

In 2008 we switched to every other week street cleaning (well, first and third days of the week). That was 2008. 12 years ago. This city has become a lot dirtier. I think we need to go back to street sweeping every week. Depending on the month, there are streets that won't get swept for weeks. Look at December of this year (see attached). Tuesday sweeping will happen Dec 1st, then Dec 15th, then 21 DAYS LATER on Jan 5th. That's three weeks with no street sweeping. Our city streets can't handle that. I'm in Pac Heights and it's getting really dirty - especially with Van Ness construction. I just ask that you think about it. A clean sidewalk and street makes residents mental state a lot better and happy. I think we are all inside so much during Covid that when we go outside we are hoping it will be clean, and no graffiti, and clean sidewalks and streets and no trash blowing around (our garbage trucks seem to have an issues getting all the garbage in the truck when they come to empty our bins). Thanks.

December 2020

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
30	1	2	3	4	5	6
						2nd Advent
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day				,		3rd Advent
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
						4th Advent
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
First Day of Writer				Christmas Day		
28	29	30	31	1	2	3
				New Year's Day		
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Epiphany				

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST MEMORANDUM

From: Rachel Force with Gabe Cabrera, Office of the Legislative Analyst (OLA)

Date: October 10, 2008

Re: **Street Sweeping** (OLA No. 017-08)

SUMMARY OF REQUESTED ACTION

Analyze the impacts of reduced mechanical street sweeping in residential neighborhoods, including fiscal impacts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based upon recommendations from three independent sources – the Controller, the Budget Analyst, and a private consultant (SEH) – the Department of Public Works (DPW) is implementing changes to its mechanical street sweeping schedule. Reports by the three sources, as well as DPW's own analysis, shows that street sweeping frequency could be reduced along certain residential corridors without significantly affecting street cleanliness. These corridors were previously swept, on average, four times per month, but will now be swept twice per month. Benefits of the reduction include annualized personnel cost savings of approximately \$1 million. In addition, some neighborhood residents have reacted favorably to the increased availability of street parking two days per month, according to DPW.

The street sweeping reduction program has potential fiscal impacts. These include:

- <u>Annualized Personnel Cost Savings of \$1 Million to the City</u>. The DPW budget included estimated savings achieved through implementation of the program, approved for Fiscal Year 2008-09. Reversal of the street sweeping reductions would require re-allocation of these funds.
- <u>Enforcement Revenue</u>. The Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) does not have an estimate of the likely impact of street sweeping reductions on enforcement revenue. Instead MTA plans to track it as the program is implemented. Notably, enforcement revenue generated in support of street sweeping operations totaled approximately \$26.6 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08.
- <u>Cost Savings to Neighborhood Residents</u>. Residents who park on these residential streets will not have to move their cars every week, saving them time and the \$50 cost of a ticket.

The OLA concurs with the recommendations of the Controller, Budget Analyst, and SEH that DPW should reduce street sweeping frequency along certain residential corridors. If MTA experiences revenue shortfalls as a result of the changes, those losses should be weighed against

the cost savings achieved by DPW; however, it is not advisable to perform unnecessary street cleaning for the sole purpose of generating fines. Instead, other enforcement efforts should be improved. The OLA recommends that an impact study be performed after the program has been in place for six months to a year. The update should examine the real fiscal impacts and measure the success of the reduced sweeping runs.

BACKGROUND

Highlights of DPW's Street Sweeping Reduction Plan¹

- Reduction in sweeping from, on average, four times per month to twice per month in low-density residential neighborhoods
- <u>Changes apply to low-density residential neighborhoods</u> only, based upon studies showing them to be cleaned more than necessary
- No change to commercial corridors, which will continue to be cleaned per existing schedules
- <u>Neighborhoods included in the change</u>: Bernal Heights, Cow Hollow, Diamond Heights, Forest Hill, Glen Park, Ingleside/Ingleside Terrace, Japantown, Jordan Park, Lakeside, Laurel Heights, Marina, Noe Valley, Pacific Heights, Park Merced, Parkside, Presidio Heights, Richmond/Inner Richmond, St. Francis Wood, Sea Cliff, Sunset, West Portal, Westwood Park
- <u>Personnel cost savings</u> of \$750,000 during fiscal year 2008-2009, with annualized savings estimated at \$1 million every year thereafter
- Implementation costs to change signage and perform outreach estimated at \$270,000
- The plan was specifically noted during Budget Committee hearings in June 2008
- <u>Phased schedule changes</u> began in some neighborhoods in August 2008 and will be complete by December 2008
- Recommendations to reduce street sweeping in certain residential areas were made by the Controller, the Budget Analyst, and an outside consultant (SEH) this plan implements those recommendations

¹ Edward D. Reiskin, Director of the Department of Public Works, letter to Supervisors Michela Alioto-Pier and Jake McGoldrick, "Ref: Mechanical Street Sweeping Program Changes," 22 September 2008. Copy in OLA File No. 017-08.

Previous Studies/Recommendations

Controller's 2005-06 and 2006-07 Parks, Streets and Sidewalks Maintenance Annual Reports

• "Reallocate DPW resources to high-need streets, away from routes that score well before and after street sweepings."²

Budget Analyst's 2007 Management Audit of the Department of Public Works

- "The data also show that some routes are consistently clean prior to sweeping, indicating the fact that these routes could be altered so that they are swept by mechanical sweepers less frequently."³
- "Recommendation 2.7: Use the data from the Proposition C⁴ inspections to reallocate resources where prudent, such as to alter the frequency of certain street cleaning schedules"⁵

Short Elliott Hendrickson (SEH) 2007 Report:

"Evaluation and Analysis of Street Sweeping Operations, City of San Francisco, California"

• "Recommendation: That BSES [Bureau of Street Environmental Services] give serious consideration to reducing sweeping frequency to monthly in the low priority, primarily residential, service areas."

Comparison with other Jurisdictions

- A majority of the cities surveyed by DPW, including San Diego, San Jose, and Los Angeles, performed residential street sweeping on a monthly basis (see Attachment provided by DPW)
- According to SEH:

"Best Practices' within the public works industry with regards to street sweeping frequency varies widely due to climate, zoning, land use, water quality concerns, and budget considerations. Generally, in most large cities, commercial/high density areas . . . are swept on a daily to weekly basis. Low to mid-density residential areas are swept 3 to 5 times per year."

 $\underline{http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/controller/reports/ParksStreetsSidewalk.pdf}$

3

² San Francisco Controller, "Parks, Streets, and Sidewalk Maintenance Annual Report," October 2007, Recommendations on page 3 of the PDF, retrieved from:

http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/sfdpw/director/DPWAuditReport.pdf, page 18.

⁴ From the Budget Analyst report, page 6 of 26: "Proposition C, which was approved by the voters in November 2003, required the Department of Public Works to set standards for street maintenance, publish maintenance schedules, and regularly evaluate Bureau performance based on the standards and schedules."

⁵ Ibid, page 25.

⁶ SEH, "Evaluation and Analysis of Street Sweeping Operations, City of San Francisco, California" (14 August 2007, Copy in OLA File No. 017-08), 7.

⁷ SEH, page 4.

Potential Impacts

Street Cleanliness

The numerous studies noted above indicate that a reduction in street sweeping along certain residential corridors will not have a negative impact on street cleanliness. DPW has indicated that they "are monitoring the outcomes very closely, and will certainly adjust as needed to ensure the continued cleanliness of our streets."

Abandoned Vehicles

According to a representative of MTA, abandoned vehicle citations are primarily complaint driven. Therefore the reduction in street cleaning is not likely to have an impact on the number of such vehicles that are cited.⁹

Enforcement Revenue

A large proportion of parking citations issued each year is for street-sweeping violations. For instance, of approximately 1.9 million parking citations issued in Fiscal Year 2007-2008, 646,000 or 34% were in support of street sweeping operations. ¹⁰ Enforcement revenue from these citations totaled approximately \$26.6 million during the same year. Recent media accounts have suggested that enforcement revenue may remain stable even with a 50% reduction in sweeping in some residential areas. This is because Parking Control Officers (PCOs) can use the same time previously spent accompanying street cleaners to issue other types of citations, such as for vehicle abandonment and obstruction of bus lanes. ¹¹ However, the above-noted MTA representative advised us that the Department does not have an estimate of the likely fiscal impact of street sweeping reductions on enforcement revenue. Instead MTA plans to track it as the program is implemented. The Board of Supervisors should require the MTA to monitor enforcement revenue starting now and to report its findings to the Board as soon as they are available.

Residents may see some economic relief because of the reduced sweeping, as it will allow them access to neighborhood on-street parking an additional two days per month. The loss of enforcement revenue from street sweeping violations can therefore be seen as a financial benefit for residents.

Budget Savings

The reduction of street sweeping frequency began in the 2008-2009 Fiscal Year, following approval of the DPW budget that included \$750,000 in savings based on the program. Implementation of the program is currently approaching Phase Three of a four phase schedule. To date, 9,250 signs have been changed to reflect the new sweeping schedule, and 6,000 signs remain to be changed. In addition, 144,000 mailers have been sent, with around 25,000 still to be sent. Newspaper ads have also been placed. The total cost of implementation is estimated at \$270,000.¹²

⁹ Judson True, MTA Media Relations Manager, conversation with author, 7 October 2008.

⁸ Reiskin, page 5.

¹⁰ Sonali Bose, MTA Chief Financial Officer, conversation with author, 14 October 2008.

¹¹ John Cote, "To save money, S.F. Cuts back street sweeping," San Francisco Chronicle, 26 August 2008, B-2;

[&]quot;Street sweeping: Less is more," San Francisco Examiner, 10 August 2008; Judson True, 7 October 2008.

¹² Christine Falvey, DPW Director of Communications and Public Affairs, email to author, 7 October 2008.

Other Savings to the City

While not yet quantified, DPW expects to realize savings related to decreased fuel use and vehicle acquisition and maintenance through implementation of the program. However, these savings are likely to be offset by rising fuel costs, according to DPW. Notably, DPW's Bureau of Street Environmental Services, which is responsible for street sweeping, spent a total of \$1,405,420 for fuel in FY 2007-08.

If the program were to be reversed now, an additional \$750,000 would need to be re-allocated to DPW this fiscal year, and the estimated \$1 million in annualized personnel cost savings would not be realized. The funds spent on implementation would be lost, and additional monies would likely be needed to reverse the signage and again notify residents about the change.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The actual financial costs and savings of the reduced street sweeping program are not currently known. Projections indicate that the City will save approximately \$1 million per year through implementation of the program, without significantly affecting street cleanliness. The OLA recommends that DPW monitor the effected streets and make adjustments to the frequency of sweeping if necessary. This includes reducing the sweeping schedule even further if it can be shown that once-monthly service would be sufficient. Enforcement revenue should also be monitored by MTA and a report on the fiscal impact should be prepared. However, if revenues are shown to decrease as a result of the reduced street sweeping, efforts should be focused on identifying strategies to improve other enforcement efforts, rather than increasing street cleaning for the sole purpose of generating citation revenue for the City. It should be remembered that the loss of this type of City funding is actually a gain for residents who avoid costly fines.

For Fiscal Year 2009-2010, both DPW and MTA should report back to the Board of Supervisors about the status of the program and its impacts (fiscal and otherwise).

¹³ Ibid.

ATTACHMENT

San Francisco Department of Public Works MECHANICAL SWEEPING RESTRUCTURING PROJECT

Street Sweeping Frequency in Low Density Residential Areas of Various Jurisdictions

Note: Based on population size, the principal cities of California included in the list below are Los Angeles, San Diego, San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland. Portland, Seattle, and New York are regularly used as SF comparables. Other cities were included in the list for various informational purposes.

(Sources: agencies' websites; phone calls to departments' staff)

No.	Jurisdiction	State	Frequency of Street Sweeping				
			Weekly	Semi-	Monthly	Less	Comments
				monthly		Frequently	
1	Alameda, City of	CA	X				All residential streets are swept weekly (2 of 3 routes). They have parking restriction signs for twice a month, but streets are swept weekly. [Population size is approximately 71,000.]
2	Albany	CA			X		
3	Baltimore	MD		Х			Twice a month in areas with low pedestrian traffic; other residential areas 4x or 2x a week
4	Berkeley	CA			X		
5	Boston	MA		X			Twice a month for 8 months (Apr 1-Nov 30) (Ex. 1st & 3rd week of month-right side of the street; 2nd & 4th week-left side of street)
6	Las Vegas	NV		X			Every two weeks
7	Los Angeles, City of	CA			X		Four-week frequency in open routes (without parking restrictions; 8,050 curb miles). In open routes, frequency changes during heavy leaf fall season (Oct-Feb). Weekly frequency in restricted parking routes (4,721 curb miles).
8	Menlo Park	CA			Х		Monthly: Mar-Oct (8 months); Weekly: Nov-Feb (4 months)
9	Minneapolis	MN				X	Twice a year (spring & fall)
10	New York	NY				X	80% of Staten Island area is swept on an "as needed" basis; remaining 20% of the area is swept at least once a week. Staten Island doesn't have parking restrictions for street cleaning. In NYC, property owners are responsible for cleaning sidewalks and gutters (18" from the curb into the street). Park Slope area in Brooklyn, NYC suspended street cleaning (alternate side parking regulations) on 5/19/08 as DOT posts new, reduced street-cleaning restrictions.
11	Oakland	CA			X		Monthly in residential areas with low traffic and out of main streets, usually not dirty areas; weekly or twice a week in high traffic areas
	Portland	OR				Х	All curb residential streets get swept 6-8 times per year. All major arterials get swept 11-12 times per year.
13	Redwood City	CA			X		
14	San Diego	CA			Х		Monthly in residential streets; weekly in commercial streets
15	San Francisco	CA	X				Weekly in low density residential areas; more often in other areas
16	San Jose	CA			Х		
17	Seattle	WA			X		Minor arterials are swept once a month; some are swept only when requested. Dept. of Transportation does not sweep nonarterial streets, but does limited leaf cleaning in the fall.
18	Sunnyvale	CA			Х		
19	Washington, DC	DC			Х		Weekly in heavily trafficked residential sections (In other residential areas, unscheduled cleaning takes place on an "as needed" basis—generally monthly or quarterly.)
		Count:	2	3	11	3	19

AB 6/16/08

REGEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2020 SEP -8 AM II: 30

June17,2020

FROM: Morley M Singer M.D.

177 BELGRAVE AVE.

SF 94117

Mzinger1@comcast.net

TO: LONDON BREED, MAYOR

GRANT COLFAX M.D.

STEPHANIE CUSHING

PHIL MATIER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RE: Functions of the Vector Control and Healthy Housing Dept.

I OWN a 3 unit building on Alma St.

I have a bill from the Vector Control program for \$112.00

If I encounter a problem with vectors, (as I have in my own home)

I employ a vector control specialist and have done so.

I am curious as to what services I get from the Vector Control Dept.

I would appreciate notification of the names, dates and times a city employee has inspected my property for vectors.

As the city can't control humans defecating on sidewalks and puts up tents for hard drug users in residential neighborhoods, I wonder if these City activities fall under the aegis of the Vector control program.?

I wonder if the city effort to provide reasonable cost housing conflicts with fees which may be passed on to tenants.

And out of curiosity only, I would appreciate explanation of the lettering

(MSPH, CHMM, REHS) attached to the name of Stephanie KJ Cushing.

Thank you for your attention. I hope for a reply.

Morley Singer M.D.

May M. Soy

26

From: president@sanfranciscodsa.com To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Cc:

Preston, Dean (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Subject: Open Letter to the Mayor

Thursday, September 3, 2020 8:45:01 AM Date:

Attachments: Open Letter to the Mayor.pdf

Probolsky Research - San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs" Association - SFO Law Enforcement Survey -

Presentation.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please read attached letter.

We have also included recent polling on the SFO.

Best regards,

Ken Lomba SFDSA President 415-513-8973 SanFranciscoDeputySheriffs.com SanFranciscoDSA.com



SAN FRANCISCO DEPUTY SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

"Serving the Deputy Sheriffs' of San Francisco since 1952"

PRESIDENT Ken Lomba VICE-PRESIDENT Christianne Crotty TREASURER Jason Moore SECRETARY Tony Aguerre SERGEANT-AT-ARMS Jim Irving

Mayor London Breed City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102 September 3, 2020

Dear Honorable Mayor London Breed,

We want to thank you for your exceptional leadership during the current health crisis. The SFDSA understands the concerns associated with a projected \$1.5 billion dollar deficit. As a result, our association would like to offer some suggestions and point out some ways we have already contributed to reducing costs for the San Francisco tax payers. We would also like to draw attention to some of the concessions and actions, including the language in our contract that benefits the City during an economic downturn.

- In July 2020, our association deferred it's 3% percent contractual raise until December 26, 2020. The deferment provided the City with an approximately 1 million dollars in savings over that time period.
- On July 31st the Sheriff's Department gave back 8% of its budget (\$40 million dollars over two years). Those funds were reallocated to provide benefits to the City's Black Community.
- On September 5th the City will close County Jail #4, providing a savings up to \$24.7 million dollars.

We would like to suggest an additional cost savings solution to assist the City and bring it to your attention for consideration. This idea has been discussed by the Board of Supervisors as a viable option and our association would appreciate your consideration in this matter. The potential plan to replace the San Francisco Police Department with the San Francisco Sheriff's Office at SFO has been discussed on several occasions by the Board of Supervisors and their committees. We would urge you to explore those significant financial benefits associated with this proposal. The implementation of this plan would increase patrol officers in the streets of San Francisco without the additional costs of hiring and training of new officers to address homicides/violent crime. The SFPD's increased presence would serve as a deterrent for theft and property crimes that plague San Francisco and threaten our tourist industry.

P.O. Box 77590 San Francisco, CA 94107 Phone: (415) 696-2428 www.SanFranciscoDSA.com Fax: (415) 658-7210

SAN FRANCISCO DEPUTY SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION



"Serving the Deputy Sheriffs' of San Francisco since 1952"

PRESIDENT Ken Lomba VICE-PRESIDENT Christianne Crotty TREASURER Jason Moore SECRETARY Tony Aguerre SERGEANT-AT-ARMS Jim Irving

A budget analyst report was conducted to determine the cost savings of Deputy Sheriffs replacing Police Officers at the San Francisco International Airport. On July 2nd the report was completed and it purports to save \$5 million a year at the San Francisco Airport. The SFO Director, Ivar Satero, stated, during the Budget and Appropriations Committee hearing on July 8th, that having SF Deputy Sheriffs at SFO is a savings to the Airlines. Satero stated, "The savings would benefit the Airline costs." The savings has the potential to protect many people from being laid off from the airline industry and this savings could further translate to lower priced flights into SFO. Clearly, San Francisco tourism could benefit from this type of stimulus following the devastating events of 2020.

The proposal would also save the City's general fund by deploying police officers from SFO to vacant positions within the City. The initial savings would be 31 million dollars, as indicated in the BLA report. Reallocating some or all of the SFPD resources currently devoted to this low crime area (SFO) to the higher crime areas of the City, like the Tenderloin has obvious benefits. Access to these additional officers for quality investigation of the significant crimes within San Francisco, would protect residents and serve as a fiscal savings in the overall budget. Foot patrols and a larger SFPD presence in areas that attract tourists would provide for a safer experience for the citizens and visitors in San Francisco. In turn, the problems facing our tourist industry and revenues that flow from them will likely improve significantly.

The Sheriff's Office specializes in addressing the law enforcement needs of government buildings and provides an excellent professional alternative to the San Francisco Police Department. The San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association urges you to consider, support and implement a phased plan to replace some or all of the law enforcement duties with the SFSO deputies at the San Francisco Airport. Thank you for any time or consideration you give to this proposal.

Best regards,

Ken Lomba SFDSA President president@sanfranciscodsa.com Cell: (415) 696-2428

San Francisco Voter Survey Deputy Sheriffs' Association SFO Law Enforcement Survey

Presentation

August 2020



Opinion Research on Elections and Public Policy

Newport Beach (949) 855-6400

San Francisco (415) 870-8150 Washington DC (202) 559-0270

San Francisco Voter - SFO Law Enforcement Survey

Survey Methodology*

From Saturday, August 15, 2020 to Wednesday, August 19, 2020, Probolsky Research conducted a live-interviewer telephone and online survey among San Francisco likely November 2020 voters.

A total of 400 voters were surveyed (133 by telephone and 267 online). A survey of this size yields a margin of error of +/-5%, with a confidence level of 95%. Interviews were conducted with respondents on both landline (40%) and mobile phones (60%) and were offered in English (90%), Spanish (5%) and Chinese (5%) languages. For the online survey phase, we invited participation via email and text message. Security measures precluded individuals from completing the survey more than once and allowed only the designated respondents to complete the survey. Online respondents were able to use their computer, tablet or smart phone to participate.


Our sample was developed from voter data compiled by the San Francisco Department of Elections and then enhanced with consumer data. Probolsky Research applies a stratified random sampling methodology to ensure that the demographic proportions of survey respondents match the demographic composition of November 2020 likely voters.

Probolsky Research is a Latina and woman owned market and opinion research firm with corporate, election, non-profit, and special interest clients.




37% say we need more police officers and a greater police presence in San Francisco

Question 1: Which best describes how you feel about police in San Francisco?




62% say they support the proposal to replace SFPD

officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs




Among those who support, 58% strongly support

the proposal to replace SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference




Results by geography





Results by language and survey mode







Message Testing



79% are more likely to support knowing that replacing

SFPD officers with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs will immediately save \$30 million









73% are definitely more likely to support knowing

that replacing SFPD officers with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs will immediately save \$30 million






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference




Results by geography






Results by language and survey mode






74% are more likely to support knowing that SFPD

officers have abused the system and are making over \$100,000 doing paperwork









76% are definitely more likely to support knowing

that SFPD officers have abused the system and are making over \$100,000 doing paperwork






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference



Results by geography

Question 4: SFPD officers have abused the system essentially creating a police department within the police department at SFO. Dozens of officers at SFO are making over \$100,000 a year by gaming the system for overtime and doing paperwork that can easily be done by non-sworn peace officers. Transitioning from SFPD to San Francisco Deputy Sheriff at SFO would allow the system to be fixed. Does knowing this make you more likely or less likely to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs? And would you say that you are definitely (more likely/less likely) or somewhat (more likely/less likely) to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs?





■ More likely


■Unsure

■ Less likely

■ Makes no difference to me

Results by language and survey mode


Question 4: SFPD officers have abused the system essentially creating a police department within the police department at SFO. Dozens of officers at SFO are making over \$100,000 a year by gaming the system for overtime and doing paperwork that can easily be done by non-sworn peace officers. Transitioning from SFPD to San Francisco Deputy Sheriff at SFO would allow the system to be fixed. Does knowing this make you more likely or less likely to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs? And would you say that you are definitely (more likely/less likely) or somewhat (more likely/less likely) to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs?




22

65% are more likely to support knowing that SFPD officers

try to get assigned to SFO because it's viewed as a cushy job instead of working in the City where they are needed









70% are definitely more likely to support knowing that

SFPD officers get assigned to SFO because it's a cushy job instead of working in the City where they are needed






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type, and party preference






Results by geography





Results by language and survey mode







68% are more likely to support knowing that the

number of of authorized police positions is too high and can be reduced with a transition to Sheriffs

Question 6: The San Francisco Controller recently found that the number of authorized police positions at SFO is too high and should be reduced, something that can be done easily in a transition from SFPD to San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs. Does knowing this make you more likely or less likely to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs? And would you say that you are definitely (more likely/less likely) or somewhat (more likely/less likely) to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs?

16.1%





64.3%




■ Makes no difference to

me

Unsure


63% are definitely more likely to support knowing that

the number of of authorized police positions is too high and can be reduced with a transition to Sheriffs






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference




Results by geography






Results by language and survey mode






56% are more likely to support knowing that San

Francisco Sheriffs are known for crisis de-escalation









72% are definitely more likely to support knowing

that San Francisco Sheriffs are known for crisis de-escalation






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference


Question 7: San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs are known for crisis de-escalation. Recently, a man brandishing a gun entered a San Francisco hospital and threatened staff and patients. San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs responded and safely ended the situation without gunfire, violence, or injuries to anyone involved. Does knowing this make you more likely or less likely to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs? And would you say that you are definitely (more likely/less likely) or somewhat (more likely/less likely) to support replacing SFPD officers at SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs?






Results by geography








Results by language and survey mode






80% say they support the proposal to replace SFPD

officers in SFO with San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs after learning more about the proposal




Among those who support, 72% strongly support

the proposal to replace SFPD officers in SFO with SF Deputy Sheriffs






Results by gender and age






Results by ethnicity, voter type and party preference






Results by geography





Results by language and survey mode







Demographics




Respondent demographics by gender, age group, ethnicity and party preference



PROBOLSKY










Respondent demographics by language, survey mode and geography





Questions?

Adam Probolsky, President

O: 949-855-6400 | M: 949-697-6726

E: adamp@probolskyresearch.com

Brenda Wolf, Research Analyst

O: 949-855-6400

E: brenda@probolskyresearch.com



Opinion Research on Elections and Public Policy

Newport Beach (949) 855-6400

San Francisco (415) 870-8150

Washington DC (202) 559-0270

RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO

2020 SEP -8 AMII: 30

September 2, 2020

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 214
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

I am writing in support of the requested amendment to permit the increase of additional hotel rooms from 250 to 300 for the SOMA Hotel on Block 1 in Mission Bay South. I understand that the interior will be reconfigured but the exterior will remain as is.

As an 11-year resident of The Radiance in Mission Bay South I am pleased with the design of the building as it is being constructed. It is one of the best looking buildings in the neighborhood. And I am thrilled that the design includes a restaurant and bar on the top floor that will be open to the public. I look forward to enjoying the food, drinks and the view.

I recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve this amendment for the SOMA hotel on Block 1 in Mission Bay.

Sincerely,

Peggy Fahnestock

330 Mission Bay Blvd N., Unit 302

Member of the Board of Directors:

South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association

agy Famestack

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Cc: Beinart, Amy (BOS); Monge, Paul (BOS); Lerma, Santiago (BOS); Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS)

Subject: FW: Racist banner

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 10:15:00 AM

----Original Message-----

From: tjjjwatson@icloud.com <tjjjwatson@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 8:39 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <box>

dos.d.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Racist banner

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi

Someone put up a very large banner in front of the bernal heights library that says white silence equals violence. This is outrageous. No one has taken it down. It is a public space, advocating violence against whites. Would this be tolerated if it were against any other group? It's inflammatory and scary. Please have someone remove it, before someone takes it seriously, and starts attacking other people We should be trying to bring people together, not advocating violence

Thank you Terry

Sent from my iPad

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Request for Reconsideration of Approval and/or Major Mitigation of India Basin Mixed-Use Project and the

Significant, Ongoing and Harmful Air Pollution it would cause in Bayview Hunters Point

Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 8:27:00 AM

Attachments: 2020-09-01-NLGSF-Greenaction-BVHP-MFC-Advocacy-Letter-Re-India-Basin-Project.pdf

image001.png

From: Zsea Bowmani <zsea@nlgsf.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 6:54 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary

<commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani,
Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;
Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>;
Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>;
MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>;
Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: greenaction@greenaction.org; Bradley Angel
bradley@greenaction.org>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration of Approval and/or Major Mitigation of India Basin Mixed-Use Project and the Significant, Ongoing and Harmful Air Pollution it would cause in Bayview Hunters Point

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources



National Lawyers Guild San Francisco Bay Area Chapter 558 Capp St | San Francisco, CA 94110 | www.nlgsf.org p: 415 285-5067 | e: contact@nlgsf.org

September 1, 2020

Dear Mayor Breed, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission: The National Lawyers Guild - San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee, and Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice write to express our strong concern about the India Basin Mixed-Use Project and request that you revisit the project in light of changed circumstances since it was first approved.

As new information reveals troubling links between air pollution, race, and COVID-19, we call upon you to commit to work with the public to reduce the project's impacts on air quality to *less than significant*, or if not feasible, to rescind approval of the project altogether for the health and safety of the community, and in furtherance of long awaited racial justice.

Please see the attached letter which provides context for our concern and the ramifications to the Bayview Hunters Point community if the India basin Project is allowed to move forward as planned. We ask for a response with your stated course of action within 30 days of receipt of our letter.

Sincerely,

National Lawyers Guild - San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice, and the Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee

Zsea Bowmani

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Leonard I. Weinglass Fellow
National Lawyers Guild - Bay Area Chapter
zsea@nlgsf.org • http://nlgsf.org

National Lawyers Guild

San Francisco Bay Area Chapter



September 1, 2020

Mayor London Breed

Board of Supervisor District 1 Sandra Lee Fewer

Board of Supervisor District 2 Catherine Stefani

Board of Supervisor District 3 Aaron Peskin

Board of Supervisor District 4 Gordon Mar

Board of Supervisor District 5 Dean Preston

Board of Supervisor District 6 Matt Haney

Board of Supervisor District 7 Norman Yee

Board of Supervisor District 8 Rafael Mandelman

Board of Supervisor District 9 Hillary Ronen

Board of Supervisor District 10 Shamann Walton

Board of Supervisor District 11 Ahsha Safaí

San Francisco Planning Commission

MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Sent via electronic mail

RE: Request for Reconsideration of Approval and/or Major Mitigation of India Basin Mixed-Use Project and the Significant, Ongoing and Harmful Air Pollution it would cause in Bayview Hunters Point

Dear Mayor Breed, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

The Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee, Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice, and the San Francisco / Bay Area Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild ("NLGSF") write to express our strong concern about the India Basin Mixed-Use Project that threatens the health and environment of Bayview Hunters Point, and to request that you revisit the project in light of changed circumstances, namely 1) the global pandemic of COVID-19 and the increased vulnerability it has created for Bayview Hunters Point, and 2) the renewed calls to address institutional racism. We write this while the community suffers with the worst air quality in the world due to smoke from the wildfires, which grow more destructive every year. As new information reveals troubling links between air pollution, race, and COVID-19, we call upon you to commit to work with the public to reduce the project's impacts on air quality to *less than significant*, or if not feasible, to rescind approval of the project altogether for the health and safety of the community and in furtherance of long awaited racial justice.

I. Introduction

As you know, the India Basin Mixed-Use Project was approved after the Board of Supervisors rejected the appeal filed by Greenaction on behalf of its members and constituents who are residents of Bayview Hunters Point. We were alarmed by the findings in the Environmental Impact Reports that the overall impacts on air quality "would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation," that "cumulative impacts related to regional air quality and health risks would be significant and unavoidable," and that the project would "contribute to new, or exacerbate existing, air quality violations" in a community already disproportionately burdened with pollution. In response, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration, a loophole in the California Environmental Quality Act, to try to justify the significant and harmful air pollution that this project would cause to community residents. They claimed that "open space" (which has toxic contamination and was never tested for radiation despite its proximity to the Shipyard Superfund Site) and so-called "affordable" housing (at approximately 20% less of market value in the most expensive housing market in the country) is more important than the health of residents and their right to breathe clean air. The Board of Supervisors then rejected the Greenaction appeal.

The Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee is a neighborhood-wide grassroots community organization comprised entirely of residents working to protect and improve the well-being of the community. Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice is a multi-racial grassroots organization based in San Francisco with many members, constituents, and staff who live in Bayview Hunters Point who will be affected by the project. We have participated in the project's environmental review and permit process since it began with the Planning Department. From the start of this process, Greenaction and the Mothers and Fathers Committee raised concerns about the air pollution the project would cause, as well as the Planning Department's blatant refusal to provide language access to the many limited and non-English speaking community residents who might be impacted by the project.

Today, the BVHP Mothers and Fathers Committee and Greenaction are joined by the Bay Area Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild and many other allies. The NLGSF has been at the forefront of supporting social movements demanding racial and economic justice in the Bay Area for the past 50 years. Given that the Indian Basin development is poised to contribute to and further magnify health, environmental, racial, and economic disparities in Bayview Hunters Point, NLGSF has a vested interest in the outcome of this proposed project.

We submit this letter on behalf of our members and constituents in Bayview Hunters Point, many of whom are low income and working class people of color whose health, environment, and civil rights will be adversely, disproportionately, and significantly impacted by the India Basin project. This letter focuses on our serious concerns with the significant and unavoidable impact that the proposed development would have on air quality in Bayview Hunters Point and its associated health risks.

For the record, we once again emphasize that we fully support cleanup of contamination and improvement of the India Basin Shoreline Park. We do not, however, support the increased, and harmful

air pollution the project would cause—air pollution that the EIR concluded would continue for the life of the project, not just during construction. Allowing the significant air pollution that would result from the project will make the India Basin Shoreline Park an unhealthy space for residents with sensitive health.

In February of this year, Mayor London Breed described this high-end housing project, designed to match the higher incomes of the city's new residents, as "true environmental justice." Moving forward with the project as approved would be antithetical to any notion of justice. The following discussion makes it clear that the harmful environmental and health outcomes and the racial disparities of the project far outweigh any supposed benefits. This was true when the Planning Commission approved the project; with the newest assault of COVID-19, the increased pollution from the project on top of existing pollution, contamination, and racial and economic disparities would be, without exaggeration, a death sentence for some Bayview Hunters Point residents.

II. COVID has exacerbated the effect of environmental racism in Bayview Hunters Point due to the high levels of existing pollution and related health issues.

Much has changed locally, nationally, and around the world since the India Basin project was approved in 2018, the most dramatic being the global outbreak of the coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19"). We have seen a worrying link between air pollution and increased risk of death from COVID-19.⁷ Studies also show that in cities across the country, people of color make up a disproportionate percentage of deaths from the coronavirus, including here in San Francisco, often due to economic neglect and underlying health conditions caused or exacerbated by pollution in their communities.⁸ **The significant and unavoidable air pollution from the India Basin project, on top of existing pollution and related illnesses, poverty, and racial disparities would make Bayview Hunters Point even more vulnerable to COVID-19 and other diseases.**

A. Studies show links between air pollution and increased risk of death from COVID-19.

Research increasingly shows that people exposed to high levels of air pollution have worse COVID-19 outcomes, including an increased risk of contracting and dying from the disease. It is worth highlighting that fine particulate matter (PM2.5), one of the forms of air pollution that the India Basin project will generate, is associated with poorer and more fatal outcomes for COVID-19. Research has shown that long term exposure to pollutants such as PM2.5 can reduce lung function and cause respiratory illness. Air pollutants such as PM2.5 have been shown to cause a persistent inflammatory response, which increases the risk of infection by viruses like COVID-19 that target the respiratory system. A nationwide study by Harvard researchers found that even a small increase in PM2.5 concentrations of 1 microgram per cubic meter is associated with an 8% increase in the overall death rate of the corvirus.

The India Basin EIR specifically addressed increased PM2.5 concentrations that would be generated during construction and operation of the India Basin project¹³ and warned that "PM2.5, can remain airborne for weeks and pose health concerns. Specifically, particulate matter can be deposited in the lungs when inhaled, causing respiratory illnesses and lung damage."¹⁴ This is incredibly alarming given that the

project would increase PM2.5 concentrations to levels that would be "significant and unavoidable with mitigation" and would exceed healthy thresholds. In fact, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) withdrew its support for the India Basin Development Project due to the 'unacceptable' air pollution it would generate. BAAQMD wrote to the Board of Supervisors, citing its concern with the dangerous levels of PM2.5 that the project would generate. "PM2.5 is by far the most harmful air pollutant in the Air District's jurisdiction," the agency said, and can cause a "wide range of health effects, such as aggravating asthma, bronchitis, respiratory and cardio-vascular symptoms, and contributing to heart attacks and death." BAAQMD even offered to work with the city to minimize the project's impacts and develop a comprehensive, community-scale air quality plan for vulnerable neighborhoods like BVHP. In the city to minimize the neighborhoods like BVHP.

B. COVID-19 worsens existing racial, ethnic, and economic disparities.

While places with environmental pollution face increased COVID-19 infection and mortality rates, nationally, people of color and low-income communities are hardest hit by the coronavirus.¹⁷ More often than not, these groups overlap: communities of color are more likely to be economically marginalized, and there is a long and ongoing history of placing polluting activities in low-income areas and communities of color.¹⁸ For example, of the 1.8 million Californians living near drilling in heavily polluted areas, 92% are from communities of color.¹⁹

In the context of the coronavirus, we see wide COVID-19 disparities by race, most dramatically for Black, Indigenous, Pacific Islander, and Latinx people.²⁰ Black people nationwide continue to experience the highest actual COVID-19 mortality rates—about 2.5 times as high as the rate for white people.²¹ To put it another way, "about 18,000 Black, 6,000 Latino, 600 Indigenous, and 70 Pacific Islander Americans would still be alive" if they had died from COVID-19 at the same rate as whites.²² A May 2020 study of over 1,000 confirmed cases in California showed that Black patients diagnosed with the coronavirus are nearly three times more likely to require hospitalization than white patients.²³ In San Francisco, people of color make up the majority of coronavirus deaths; half of all COVID-19 cases are people who are Latinx; and neighborhoods that are predominately Black, Latinx, or Asian and low income or working class, have seen the highest number of cases according to the city's COVID-19 data tracker.²⁴

Dr. Sheryl Davis, the Executive Director of San Francisco Human Rights Commission, recognizes that "The same people you see being impacted by [COVID-19] have experienced other inequities in San Francisco" and that our "system is flawed." Indeed, even Mayor Breed has acknowledged that the higher rates of COVID-19 in these communities demonstrates a "clear disparity." Yet this disparity is not a new development; it is the result of years of economic neglect, lingering radioactive and toxic contamination at the Hunter's Point Shipyard Superfund Site, and prioritizing development money over the health and wellbeing of low-income residents and residents of color. This disparity will only multiply if the proposed India Basin project is allowed to go forward as currently planned.

C. Pollution, racism, and poverty make Bayview Hunters Point particularly vulnerable to and suffer disproportionately from COVID-19.

The City and County of San Francisco have long acknowledged that Bayview Hunters Point residents suffer the cumulative health impacts from many pollution sources, including the notorious radioactive contamination at the Hunters Point Shipyard Superfund Site located next to India Basin. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District has identified Bayview Hunters Point as a CARE Community, an acknowledgement of the air quality problems afflicting the community. The State of California's CalEnviroScreen 3.0 confirms Bayview Hunters Point is one of the communities most at risk from pollution in the entire state, and concluded that it has a higher pollution burden than 90% of the state. CalEnviroScreen, developed by California EPA, measures vulnerability through evaluating and quantifying pollution exposures, environmental effects, sensitive populations and socioeconomic factors. For example, it ranks in the 98th percentile for asthma and very high for both diesel emissions and hazardous waste.

Given what we currently know about the role of pollution, race, and poverty in COVID-19 cases, it is unsurprising that Bayview Hunters Point has been hit especially hard by COVID-19. As of August, Bayview Hunters Point has the highest rate of COVID-19 infection.²⁷ The significant and unavoidable air pollution from the India Basin project would increase the community's risk of contracting COVID-19, aggravate other pollution-related disease, and all but ensure even more deaths in Bayview Hunters Point.

It is shocking and unacceptable that the City and County would approve any project that would add significant and unhealthy amounts of air pollution to an already overburdened community like Bayview Hunters Point, claiming that other "benefits" are "overriding." Nothing is more important than life, and air pollution kills. The added danger of COVID-19 makes the exclusive housing project all the more unjustified.

III. Renewed national attention on institutionalized racism requires reconsideration of the India Basin project.

The brutal police killings of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd earlier this year, and the senseless deaths of several other Black Americans exposed the stark racial disparities in the US much like the coronavirus pandemic, but far more acutely. For the first time in decades, we are collectively reckoning with the deep-seated racism that infects every aspect of our society—from policing to healthcare, to education, jobs, law, religion, entertainment, and of course the environment. Communities and activists have transformed these deaths from moments of grief and outrage into a powerful movement for racial justice.

As millions take to the streets and brave the still raging pandemic, many institutions, including cities and other government bodies, have acknowledged the role that racism has historically played and continues to play in shaping their decisions. Some have even gone beyond issuing oblique commitments to justice and have begun to identify clear and effective steps to undo and rectify the harm of institutionalized racism.

The institutionalized racism here in San Francisco cannot be overstated. It is at the root of most if not all of the racial disparities plaguing the city, many of which have already been discussed. For Bayview Hunters Point, one of the last communities of color in the city, the various obstacles the residents have faced—from failures to translate key development notices and documents into languages spoken by residents, to ongoing scandals of the Hunter's Point shipyard testing and clean up, to the decision to push ahead with the luxury residential development despite its significant and unavoidable health and environmental impacts—have all made it clear that racial equity has not been a priority in San Francisco for some time.

This is an unprecedented moment; the City and County of San Francisco can take the opportunity to ensure it ends up on the right side of history. Given the racial disparities outlined in this letter, it would run counter to this political moment to move forward with the proposed project, knowing the risks identified in the EIR are exacerbated by COVID-19. To reiterate, the supposed benefits of the project will not outweigh the projected burdens to an already overburdened community. Moreover, the India Basin project combined with the Shipyard project will add tens of thousands of mostly upper income residents to Bayview Hunters Point, resulting in the gentrification and ultimately displacement of long time residents and small community-owned businesses, and of one of the last communities of color in San Francisco. It would, to put it simply, be racially unjust to proceed with the project as approved.

IV. Request to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors:

Based on the above considerations, we ask that the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission provide the following remedies: (1) Offer feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures that are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR such that they would lessen the health and environmental impacts of the project to *less than significant*; (2) open these project alternatives or mitigation measures up for public comment; (3) test the entire India Basin project area for radioactive and toxic contamination, with meaningful community oversight; (4) require much more extensive and proper testing and cleanup at the nearby Shipyard Superfund Site, with meaningful community oversight.

A. Need to confirm the extent of radioactive and toxic contamination at the proposed site.

The India Basin project must include a thorough testing, analysis, and summary of potentially radioactive and toxic contaminants before any use of the proposed site. The proposed project area is in close proximity to contaminated Superfund sites with radioactive and toxic contaminants. Initial data from the Hunters Point Community Biomonitoring Project suggests that shipyard contamination has likely migrated into nearby homes and businesses, and potentially sickening residents and workers.³⁰ As such, we request that all properties within the project area are thoroughly tested for radioactive contamination and remediated, with meaningful community oversight to assure the public that the proposed project will not threaten the health and safety of the community.

Conclusion

In response to the disproportionate toll COVID-19 has had on Bayview Hunters Point and other communities of color, Director Davis of the Human Rights Commission said that the City and County of San Francisco "must acknowledge a need to shift how our city systems partner and collaborate with those most impacted to change outcomes, not just during this crisis—but moving forward." We agree. The coronavirus pandemic will eventually pass, but Bayview Hunters Point residents must live with the consequences of COVID-19 and its disparate effects caused by pollution and racial and economic inequity. Director Davis insisted that San Francisco's response "must also be rooted in trusting the resilient communities most at-risk of exposure to the coronavirus to guide a community-led response."31 The Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee, Greenaction, and the NLGSF also call upon the City and County of San Francisco to heed these words and trust the resilience of Bayview Hunters Point residents and allow them and other impacted communities to lead the way forward.

For all the above reasons, we ask you, Mayor Breed, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission, to commit to working with the community to reduce the projected impacts to less than significant or rescind the approval of the India Basin Mixed-Use Project's commercial component. We support remediation and improvement of the Shoreline Park, but that park needs to be a safe and healthy place for residents—free from the harmful air pollution the Mixed-Use Project would cause. We ask for a response to our letter with your stated course of action within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Leaotis Martin & Renay Jenkins

Co-Coordinators

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice renay jenkins@yahoo.com

Zsea Bowmani, J.D.

Leonard I. Weinglass Fellow National Lawyers Guild / San Francisco Bay Area Chapter zsea@nlgsf.org

Bradley Angel

Executive Director

bradlev@greenaction.org

Endnotes

1. Alix Martichoux, *Bay Area air quality worst in the world as wildfires rage in all but one county*, ABC 7 NEWS, (last visited Aug. 31, 2020)

https://abc7news.com/smoke-forecast-bay-area-in-sf-today-air-pollution-wildfire/6377953/

- 2. Julie Cart & Judy Lin, *California's worsening wildfires, explained*, CALMATTERS (updated Aug. 20, 2020), https://calmatters.org/explainers/californias-worsening-wildfires-explained/
- 3. India Basin Final RTC, 2-23
- 4. Supra, 4-69
- 5. Supra, 2-21, 2-22.
- 6. State Awards \$8.5 Million for Waterfront Park in India Basin, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR (Feb. 27, 2020),

- 7. Rachel Frazin, *Experts see worrisome link between coronavirus, pollution*, THE HILL (Apr. 12, 2020), https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/492314-experts-see-worrisome-link-between-coronavirus-pollution.
- 8. Katherine Bagley, Connecting the Dots Between Environmental Injustice and the Coronavirus, YALE ENVIRONMENT 360 (May 7, 2020),

https://e360.yale.edu/features/connecting-the-dots-between-environmental-injustice-and-the-coronavirus.

9. Paul Costello, *Why air pollution is linked to severe cases of COVID-19*, SCOPE BY STANFORD MEDICINE (Jul. 17, 2020),

https://scopeblog.stanford.edu/2020/07/17/why-air-pollution-is-linked-to-severe-cases-of-covid-19/.

10. Matt Cole, "Air pollution exposure linked to higher COVID-19 cases and deaths – new study," *The Conversation*,

https://theconversation.com/air-pollution-exposure-linked-to-higher-covid-19-cases-and-deaths-new-study-141620 (Jul. 13, 2020).

- 11. Supra.
- 12. Xiao Wu et al., Exposure to air pollution and COVID-19 mortality in the United States: A nationwide cross-sectional study, MEDRXIV, (Apr. 24, 2020), https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20054502.
- 13. Supra, note 1, 2-22.
- 14. Supra, 4-70.
- 15. Supra, 2-22.
- 16. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Re: India Basin Mixed Use Project* (Aug. 28, 2019),

https://greenaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/India-Basin.pdf

17. Tiffany Ford et al., *Race gaps in COVID-19 deaths are even bigger than they appear*, BROOKINGS INSTITUTION (Jun. 16, 2020),

https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/06/16/race-gaps-in-covid-19-deaths-are-even-bigger-than-they-appear/

18. Rob Jordan, *Stanford researcher discusses link between air pollution and COVID-19*, STANFORD NEWS (Jun. 30, 2020),

https://news.stanford.edu/2020/06/30/links-covid-19-air-pol lution/.

- 19. Jane Fonda & Don Martin, *Why does California's Legislature tolerate the oil industry's environmental racism?* SACRAMENTO BEE (Jul. 17, 2020), https://www.sacbee.com/opinion/california-forum/article24 4232417.html.
- 20. AMP Research Lab Staff, *The Color of Coronavirus: Covid-19 Deaths by Race and Ethnicity in the U.S.*, AMERICAN PUBLIC MEDIA (last visited Aug. 7, 2020), https://www.apmresearchlab.org/covid/deaths-by-race
- 21. *The COVID Racial Data Tracker*, ATLANTIC (last visited Aug. 7, 2020), https://covidtracking.com/race. *Supra*, note 17.
- 23. Julian Glover, Coronavirus Impact: Black COVID-19 patients nearly 3 times more likely to be hospitalized, study finds, ABC 7 NEWS (last visited Aug. 7, 2020), https://abc7news.com/coronavirus-by-race-sutter-health-study-african-american-community-deaths/6202118/.
- 24. See Population Characteristics, DATASF (last visited Aug. 7, 2020), https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/w6za-6st8, Map of Confirmed Cases and Deaths, DATASF (last visited Aug. 7, 2020),

https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/adm5-wq8i/.

25. Meaghan M. Mitchell, With COVID-19 heavily impacting African-Americans, Bayview officials seek more help, HOODLINE (May 1, 2020),

https://hoodline.com/2020/05/with-covid-19-heavily-impacting-african-americans-bayview-officials-seek-more-help.

- 26. Amy Graff, *Who is getting COVID-19 in San Francisco? Here's a breakdown*, SF GATE (Jul. 24, 2020), https://www.sfgate.com/news/editorspicks/article/Who-is-getting-COVID-19-in-San-Francisco-Here-s-15428888.php.
- 27. Supra note 21, Map of Confirmed Cases and Deaths.
- 28. Bradley Angel, Greenaction for Health And
 Environmental Justice Appeal of Planning Commission
 Approval of India Basin Mixed Use Project,

GREENACTION FOR HEALTH & ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (Sept. 5, 2020),

https://greenaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Press-Release-Sept-5-2019-Air-District-reverses-support-for-Indi a-Basin-Mixed-Use-Development-in-Bayview-Hunters-Point.pdf.

29. Jason Fagone and Cynthia Dizikes, *SF shipyard scandal: Pelosi calls for federal probes*, SF CHRONICLE (Aug. 2, 2018),

https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/San-Francisco-shipyard-scandal-Pelosi-calls-for-13121300.php.

30. Chris Roberts, *Toxic Metals Found in Shipyard Neighbors, but Source Still Unknown*, SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC PRESS (May 12, 2020),

https://sfpublicpress.org/toxic-metals-found-in-shipyard-neighbors-but-source-still-unknown/.

31. San Francisco Releases Map of Coronavirus Impact by Zip Code, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR (Apr. 20, 2020),

https://sfmayor.org/article/san-francisco-releases-map-coronavirus-impact-zip-code.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: SF police under fire for watching protests live on security cameras – The San Francisco Examiner, 28-Aug-

2020.

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:36:00 AM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com> **Sent:** Friday, August 28, 2020 2:28 PM

To: SFPD Tiffany Gunter <tiffany.l.gunter@sfgov.orv>; Lim, Oliver (POL) <Oliver.Lim@sfgov.org>;

Padrones, Robert (POL) <robert.padrones@sfgov.org>; chris@unionsquarebid.com

Cc: SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; press@eff.org; legal@eff.org

Subject: RE: SF police under fire for watching protests live on security cameras – The San Francisco

Examiner, 28-Aug-2020.

Ms. Gunter and the SFPD Homeland Security Unit,

Your transparently weak explanation that you sought access to Union Square live camera feeds on multiple occasions does not hold up to the smell test. And I'm being polite.

Why didn't you seek live camera access outside of Mission or Tenderloin SRO hotels during protests over the murder of George Floyd by what we used to call Pigs? (Now we refer to Cops as 'Peace 'Officers.')

Your Homeland Security Unit was more concerned with white, global luxury brands' corporate property in Union Square than with imminent harm to Black **or Brown** life. I was unaware of protests planned or carried out in Union Square during the dates in question. Smell test boys. Smell test.

I will press our San Francisco elected officials to thoroughly investigate and charge any and all SFPD personnel or institutions local or federal who violated local OVERSIGHT. I demand the truth. You work for the people.

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

Media Link:

https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/sf-police-repeatedly-secure-access-to-camera-network-for-live-surveillance-emails-show/

Sent from	my N	Vetro	Ву	T-Mo	bile	4G	LTE	Andr	bic	Dev	ice

Original message

From: "Board of Supervisors, (BOS)" < board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org >

Date: 8/3/20 12:37 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: rjsloan < rjsloan@vahoo.com >

Subject: RE: SF police under fire for watching protests live on security cameras – The San Francisco

Examiner

Hello,

Thank you for your email, it has been sent to the Board Members and will appear in the Petitions and Communication Section of the August 11, 2020 Board agenda.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

From: rjsloan <<u>rjsloan@yahoo.com</u>>

Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 10:32 PM

eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org www.sfbos.org

To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) < sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS)

<<u>catherine.stefani@sfgov.org</u>>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <<u>aaron.peskin@sfgov.org</u>>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <<u>gordon.mar@sfgov.org</u>>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <<u>dean.preston@sfgov.org</u>>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <<u>matt.haney@sfgov.org</u>>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <<u>norman.yee@sfgov.org</u>>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <<u>rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org</u>>; Ronen, Hillary <<u>hillary.ronen@sfgov.org</u>>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <<u>shamann.walton@sfgov.org</u>>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <<u>ahsha.safai@sfgov.org</u>>; Board of Supervisors,

(BOS) < board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: Davis, Sheryl (HRC) < sheryl.davis@sfgov.org>

Subject: SF police under fire for watching protests live on security cameras – The San Francisco Examiner

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Despite your earlier legislative attempt to prevent the SFPD from accessing and monitoring **privately** operated cameras without prior review of scope, this recent blatant disregard for local law enforcement oversight indicates a local and Federal preoccupation with the safety of white

corporate property over Black lives during a recent period following the murder of George Floyd by tax-payer funded local police officers.

Why weren't the Federal Homeland Security personnel arranging in writing with SFPD leadership to monitor merchant districts OTHER THAN where global brands maintain flagship retail operations (such as the Mission district, the Fillmore, Hayes Valley or elsewhere in the City)?

I support a thorough investigation into these potentially unlawful acts and await the announcement of appropriate legal charges against individuals and/or local and Federal law enforcement institutions.

Thank you for your consideration,

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

SF Examiner link: https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/sf-police-under-fire-for-watching-protests-live-on-security-cameras/

Sent from my Metro By T-Mobile 4G LTE Android Device

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Proposed Relaxation of SFDPH SRO COVID-19 Emergency Ordinance. Permissable Medical Experiments. The

Hippocratic Oath.

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:58:00 AM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2020 8:35 PM

To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) < grant.colfax@sfdph.org>

Cc: Supervisor Peskin <aaron.peskin@earthlink.net>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>;

Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR)

Subject: Proposed Relaxation of SFDPH SRO COVID-19 Emergency Ordinance. Permissable Medical

Experiments. The Hippocratic Oath.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

29-Aug-2020

To:

Dr. Grant Colfax, M.D.
San Francisco Department of Public Health
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 255-3525

Dr. Grant Colfax,

Regarding "Protections for Occupants of Residential Hotels During Covid-19 Pandemic:"

On 19-May-2020, the SFBOS unanimously adopted the present Emergency Ordinance requiring the SFDPH to expedite outreach, support and testing of SRO residents in the event of a coronavirus positive test in a San Francisco county SRO residence.

At the 17-Aug-2020 hearing on this matter, your department proposed removing the ordinances' mandate to conduct outreach to SRO residents within 48 hours of a confirmed coronavirus test positive case.

SFDPH staff, under your leadership and reporting to the City's Executive Branch, is arguing that it should be free to await an outbreak within an SRO building (defined as three [3] tenants testing positive) BEFORE you initiate meaningful outreach to notify neighbors, offer additional building-wide testing, deep cleaning, and other mitigation efforts including adequate mask distribution--all purportedly designed to halt community coronavirus spread

in dangerous congregate-living and congregate-care settings.

For your Department of Public Health to sit back and wait for additional community spread before acting indicates to this constituent further proof that you are imposing a de facto herd-immunity experiment on un-consenting Human residents including innocent children and the mentally ill living in socio-economic containment zone neighborhoods (and the associated essential workforce). Proof of my suspicion lies in the lack of action demonstrated by your DPH in the 538 KNOWN positive coronavirus cases to-date across 121 San Francisco SRO hotel buildings.

This stance argued and practiced in real-time by your department is a serious ethical violation of your medical Hippocratic oath to 'do no harm.' I will be pursuing this line of inquiry to it furthest conclusion.

As a reminder, here are the ten codes that must inform medical research (even de facto public health research) which emerged from the Nuremberg Trials:

- 1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.
- 2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.
- 3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.
- 4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.
- 5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.
- 6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
- 7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.
- 8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.
- 9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.
- 10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the

experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee Chair, Supervisor Aaron Peskin, et. al..

RELATED ARTICLES

Nuremberg Code Media Link: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg Code

Permissable Medical Experiments Media Links (Holocaust Museum Resources):

https://www.ushmm.org/information/exhibitions/online-exhibitions/special-focus/doctors-trial/nuremberg-code#Permissible

https://www.ushmm.org/information/exhibitions/online-exhibitions/special-focus/doctors-trial/nuremberg-code

Sent from my Metro By T-Mobile 4G LTE Android Device

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: SFDPH SRO Emergency Ordinance #8420, 19-May-2020. -- ***Request For Data Dashboard "Community

Spread Early Indicator "CT Values.""*** -- Coronavirus Gold Standard PCR Test CT Value ("Viral Shed"

Indicator). SF SRO Dashboard ACTIONABLE Data-Reporting

Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 2:00:00 PM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 11:12 PM

To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) <grant.colfax@sfdph.org>; Cohen, Stephanie <stephanie.cohen@sfdph.org>

Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>;

Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>;

Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; DPH-DOC Data Request

<DPH.DOC.DataRequest@sfdph.org>

Subject: SFDPH SRO Emergency Ordinance #8420, 19-May-2020. -- ***Request For Data Dashboard "Community Spread Early Indicator 'CT Values.'"*** -- Coronavirus Gold Standard PCR Test CT Value ('Viral Shed' Indicator). SF SRO Dashboard ACTIONABLE Data-Reporting ...

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

31-Aug-2020

To:

Dr. Grant Colfax, M.D., Director.
Dr. Stephanie Cohen, M.D.,
San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Doctors Colfax and Cohen,

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (SFBOS) Land Use and Transportation Committee today you indicated a willingness to change your publically-reported congregate-living/care coronavirus community spread mitigation stance (Emergency Ordinance #8420, 19-May-2020) from 'wait and see' to proactive prevention on the ground across the City. Relationship building with SRO residents and SRO operators will become front and center to your new approach (you've alleged).

Please consider reporting not only binary, positive/negative PCR test values but the far more ACTIONABLE "CT value" or 'Viral Shed' values per neighborhood testing-site location. We must have more granularity of viral shed CT value data within zip codes. Period. Full stop.

Congregate-living/care settings which are also workplaces filled with non-profit essential workers must understand ASAP how much virus the newly diagnosed coronavirus patient is shedding. As is reported in the New York Times, the "CT value" is the best early indicator (aside from neighborhood sewage testing) of community spread propensity that we can now identify.

Please inform yourselves and our SFBOS elected officials of Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health's Dr. Michael Mina's mitigation strategy centered around **community** CT value reporting.

Silence is not an option.

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 RJSRJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

CC: San Francisco City Attorney, CA Department of Public Health.

29-Aug-2020 The New York Times

The Coronavirus Outbreak

The usual diagnostic tests may simply be too sensitive and too slow to contain the spread of the virus.

Tests authorized by the F.D.A. provide only a yes-no answer to infection, and will identify as positive patients with low amounts of virus in their bodies.

By Apoorva Mandavilli Aug. 29, 2020

Some of the nation's leading public health experts are raising a new concern in the endless debate over coronavirus testing in the United States: The standard tests are diagnosing huge numbers of people who may be carrying relatively insignificant amounts of the virus.

Most of these people are not likely to be contagious, and identifying them may contribute to bottlenecks that prevent those who are contagious from being found in time. But researchers say the solution is not to test less, or to skip testing people without symptoms, as recently suggested by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Instead, new data underscore the need for more widespread use of rapid tests, even if they are less sensitive.

"The decision not to test asymptomatic people is just really backward," said Dr. Michael Mina, an epidemiologist at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, referring to the C.D.C.

recommendation.

"In fact, we should be ramping up testing of all different people," he said, "but we have to do it through whole different mechanisms."

In what may be a step in this direction, the Trump administration announced on Thursday that it would purchase 150 million rapid tests.

The most widely used diagnostic test for the new coronavirus, called a PCR test, provides a simple yes-no answer to the question of whether a patient is infected.

But similar PCR tests for other viruses do offer some sense of how contagious an infected patient may be: The results may include a rough estimate of the amount of virus in the patient's body.

"We've been using one type of data for everything, and that is just plus or minus — that's all," Dr. Mina said. "We're using that for clinical diagnostics, for public health, for policy decision-making."

But yes-no isn't good enough, he added. It's the amount of virus that should dictate the infected patient's next steps. "It's really irresponsible, I think, to forgo the recognition that this is a quantitative issue," Dr. Mina said.

The PCR test amplifies genetic matter from the virus in cycles; the fewer cycles required, the greater the amount of virus, or viral load, in the sample. The greater the viral load, the more likely the patient is to be contagious.

This number of amplification cycles needed to find the virus, called the cycle threshold, is never included in the results sent to doctors and coronavirus patients, although it could tell them how infectious the patients are.

In three sets of testing data that include cycle thresholds, compiled by officials in Massachusetts, New York and Nevada, up to 90 percent of people testing positive carried barely any virus, a review by The Times found.

On Thursday, the United States recorded 45,604 new coronavirus cases, according to a database maintained by The Times. If the rates of contagiousness in Massachusetts and New York were to apply nationwide, then perhaps only 4,500 of those people may actually need to isolate and submit to contact tracing.

One solution would be to adjust the cycle threshold used now to decide that a patient is infected. Most tests set the limit at 40, a few at 37. This means that you are positive for the coronavirus if the test process required up to 40 cycles, or 37, to detect the virus.

Tests with thresholds so high may detect not just live virus but also genetic fragments, leftovers from infection that pose no particular risk — akin to finding a hair in a room long after a person has left, Dr. Mina said.

Any test with a cycle threshold above 35 is too sensitive, agreed Juliet Morrison, a virologist at the University of California, Riverside. "I'm shocked that people would think that 40 could represent a positive," she said.

A more reasonable cutoff would be 30 to 35, she added. Dr. Mina said he would set the figure at 30, or even less. Those changes would mean the amount of genetic material in a patient's sample would have to be 100-fold to 1,000-fold that of the current standard for the test to return a positive result — at least, one worth acting on.

"It's just kind of mind-blowing to me that people are not recording the C.T. values from all these tests, that they're just returning a positive or a negative," one virologist said. Credit... Erin Schaff/The New York Times

The Food and Drug Administration said in an emailed statement that it does not specify the cycle threshold ranges used to determine who is positive, and that "commercial manufacturers and laboratories set their own."

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said it is examining the use of cycle threshold measures "for policy decisions." The agency said it would need to collaborate with the F.D.A. and with device manufacturers to ensure the measures "can be used properly and with assurance that we know what they mean."

The C.D.C.'s own calculations suggest that it is extremely difficult to detect any live virus in a sample above a threshold of 33 cycles. Officials at some state labs said the C.D.C. had not asked them to note threshold values or to share them with contact-tracing organizations.

For example, North Carolina's state lab uses the Thermo Fisher coronavirus test, which automatically classifies results based on a cutoff of 37 cycles. A spokeswoman for the lab said testers did not have access to the precise numbers.

This amounts to an enormous missed opportunity to learn more about the disease, some experts said.

"It's just kind of mind-blowing to me that people are not recording the C.T. values from all these tests — that they're just returning a positive or a negative," said Angela Rasmussen, a virologist at Columbia University in New York.

"It would be useful information to know if somebody's positive, whether they have a high viral load or a low viral load," she added.

Officials at the Wadsworth Center, New York's state lab, have access to C.T. values from tests they have processed, and analyzed their numbers at The Times's request. In July, the lab identified 794 positive tests, based on a threshold of 40 cycles.

With a cutoff of 35, about half of those tests would no longer qualify as positive. About 70 percent would no longer be judged positive if the cycles were limited to 30.

In Massachusetts, from 85 to 90 percent of people who tested positive in July with a cycle threshold of 40 would have been deemed negative if the threshold were 30 cycles, Dr. Mina said. "I would say that none of those people should be contact-traced, not one," he said.

Other experts informed of these numbers were stunned.

"I'm really shocked that it could be that high — the proportion of people with high C.T. value results," said Dr. Ashish Jha, director of the Harvard Global Health Institute. "Boy, does it really change the way we need to be thinking about testing."

Dr. Jha said he had thought of the PCR test as a problem because it cannot scale to the volume, frequency or speed of tests needed. "But what I am realizing is that a really substantial part of the problem is that we're not even testing the people who we need to be testing," he said.

The number of people with positive results who aren't infectious is particularly concerning, said Scott Becker, executive director of the Association of Public Health Laboratories. "That worries me a lot, just because it's so high," he said, adding that the organization intended to meet with Dr. Mina to discuss the issue.

The F.D.A. noted that people may have a low viral load when they are newly infected. A test with less sensitivity would miss these infections.

But that problem is easily solved, Dr. Mina said: "Test them again, six hours later or 15 hours later or whatever," he said. A rapid test would find these patients quickly, even if it were less sensitive, because their viral loads would quickly rise.

PCR tests still have a role, he and other experts said. For example, their sensitivity is an asset when identifying newly infected people to enroll in clinical trials of drugs.

But with 20 percent or more of people testing positive for the virus in some parts of the country, Dr. Mina and other researchers are questioning the use of PCR tests as a frontline diagnostic tool.

People infected with the virus are most infectious from a day or two before symptoms appear till about five days after. But at the current testing rates, "you're not going to be doing it frequently enough to have any chance of really capturing somebody in that window," Dr. Mina added.

Highly sensitive PCR tests seemed like the best option for tracking the coronavirus at the start of the pandemic. But for the outbreaks raging now, he said, what's needed are coronavirus tests that are fast, cheap and abundant enough to frequently test everyone who needs it — even if the tests are less sensitive.

"It might not catch every last one of the transmitting people, but it sure will catch the most transmissible people, including the superspreaders," Dr. Mina said. "That alone would drive epidemics practically [to zero.]"

Apoorva Mandavilli is a reporter for The Times, focusing on science and global health. She is the 2019 winner of the Victor Cohn Prize for Excellence in Medical Science Reporting. TWITTER: @apoorva_nyc

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

From: rjsloan

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

Cc: Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS);

Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS);

Safai, Ahsha (BOS)

Subject: SFBOS To SFPL: Register Voters 2020? -- Safe. Trustworthy. Open.

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 6:51:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

New York Times Opinion:

How Libraries Can Save the 2020 Election.

They are among our last trusted institutions. Expanding early voting at local branches may be our best hope for a trusted outcome.

By Eric Klinenberg

Dr. Klinenberg is a sociologist at New York University.

Sept. 3, 2020, 5:00 a.m. ET

As states rush to adapt their election systems amid the coronavirus pandemic, officials estimate that 80 million Americans plan to vote by mail this fall, twice as many as in 2016.

Because of Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's decision to remove or cripple key components of America's mail system just weeks before Election Day and President Trump's open efforts to discredit mail-in voting, millions are worried their ballots won't be counted in time, or even counted at all.

Last week, congressional Democrats and several governors from both parties called for Mr. DeJoy to reinstall the high-speed sorting machines and mailboxes that he removed in an inexplicable hurry. He flatly refused. The House passed a \$25 billion bill to revive the Postal Service before the election. The Republican-controlled Senate refused to consider it. New York's attorney general, Letitia James, called the Postal Service system overhaul "nothing more than a voter suppression tactic." But a speedy judicial resolution is unlikely.

Fortunately, there is a largely overlooked part of the civic infrastructure that is ready and able to help Americans exercise the franchise, even under these troubling circumstances: libraries.

Libraries already serve as polling places on Election Day throughout the country and, crucially, they provide secure, monitored ballot boxes where absentee voters can drop off their ballots before Nov. 3 and know that it will count. Secure boxes for absentee ballots are already available at some libraries in California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Utah and Washington. Other states should follow suit.

There are more than 9,000 public libraries across the United States — in cities, suburbs, rural areas and small towns. In surveys, libraries rank among the most trusted institutions in

America. They assist with the census and offer voter registration services. They are open to everyone. They are nonpartisan. They are free.

Even in today's fractured digital age, libraries rank among the most popular and well-visited places in our cultural landscape. According to a 2019 Gallup poll, on average, U.S. adults go to the library nearly once a month, making library visits "the most common cultural activity Americans engage in, by far." So why not lean on their relative stability and popularity amid this crisis?

For those curious about how the process of early voting at a library works, the mechanics are remarkably simple. As explained by the U.S. Electoral Assistance Commission, an independent, bipartisan body that certifies the nation's voting systems, voters may deliver their ballots to a drop box — a secure, locked structure operated by election officials — "from the time they receive them in the mail up to the time polls close on Election Day."

The commission presciently notes that early use of ballot boxes are especially beneficial when voters experience "lack of trust in the postal process, fear that their ballot could be tampered with, or concern that their signature will be exposed" and if they are worried "about meeting the postmark deadline and ensuring that their ballot is returned in time to be counted."

In the past few weeks, local leaders in a number of states have moved to expand the supply of ballot boxes at libraries. In Milwaukee, concerns about delays in the postal system and the coronavirus pandemic led officials to install 15 new steel ballot drop-off boxes at branches around the city.

Officials in King County, Wash., just installed a similar network of secure ballot boxes at libraries. County workers carefully selected branch locations so that more than 90 percent of residents live within three miles of a drop box. The goal, the election board wrote in a fact sheet, is "to remove barriers to voting and to support every eligible King County resident to exercise their right to participate in decisions about their community."

Perhaps in a less polarized time, expanding early voting at libraries would be uncontroversial. Unfortunately, officials in some states and counties have shown little interest in easing hurdles to voting.

In Ohio, an important swing state where residents in Democratic-leaning counties are deeply concerned about long lines and dangerous conditions for in-person voters, library leaders in Cuyahoga County called for the state to install a network of drop-off boxes similar to those in Washington and Wisconsin. Frank LaRose, Ohio's secretary of state, a Republican whose office oversees election processes, denied the request. Mr. LaRose will allow only one ballot box per county — and only at a board of elections office. The Ohio Democratic Party filed a lawsuit last week to force the state to install more boxes. It's unclear, however, whether the courts will make a ruling in time to force any potential changes.

Under the status quo, the United States is barreling toward a historic democratic crisis. The legitimacy of our entire electoral system, and with it our federal government, is at stake. Making ballot boxes widely available at libraries and at accessible outdoor places is a safe and inexpensive way for government at all levels to promote our core civic duty. It should be a universal goal among state leaders.

It's already clear that neither the president nor Congress nor the Postal Service will do what's necessary to ensure the integrity of the 2020 election. The library, still among the most revered institutions in our fragile democratic experiment, may well be our best hope.

Eric Klinenberg (@ericklinenberg), a professor in the social sciences at New York University, is the author of "Palaces for the People: How Social Infrastructure Can Help Fight Inequality, Polarization, and the Decline of Civic Life."

The Times is committed to publishing a diversity of letters to the editor. We'd like to hear what you think about this or any of our articles. Here are some tips. And here's our email: letters@nytimes.com.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook, Twitter (@NYTopinion) and Instagram.

Safe Media Link: https://nyti.ms/34ZuHhT

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Coalition on Homelessness Academic Research on SF Homelessness. -- Data Results Presentation, 03-Sep-

2020.

Date: Friday, September 4, 2020 10:49:00 AM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 7:55 AM

To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>

Subject: Coalition on Homelessness Academic Research on SF Homelessness. -- Data Results

Presentation, 03-Sep-2020.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good Morning Supervisor Fewer,

You may have seen this Coalition on Homelessness research released yesterday in the news.

Here is a link for the Facebook presentation:

https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=755284618373640&id=140260129335933

Turns out that 13% (N=584) of SF evictions are of those currently living in permanent supportive housing. Doesn't seem fully 'permanent' does it?

18% of homeless respondents indicated that they HAD ONCE BEEN in a permanent supportive housing setting. Again, doesn't the word and concept of 'permanency' mean something to those formerly unhoused needing long-term safety to recover from trauma and to thrive once more?

There is a partial supportive housing non-profit #Fail emerging from this freshly released data.

A cursory review of this data points to the need to increase the quality of non-profit supportive housing service interventions rather than allowing non-profits to rely on too-early evictions from supportive housing settings for reasons such as 'nuisance.'

I'm pushing elected officials to stop allowing supportive housing non-profits to evict tenants. Period. Full stop.

As an alternative, perhaps different providers or different buildings within the portfolio of the same non-profit provider could specialize in different interventions?

Not to corral all meth users, for example, into 'meth treatment buildings.' But something like

specialized intervention buildings. Not silos. I don't have the answer here. I just bring this important question to the community conversation.

Just some thoughts.

Best,

Randall ('RJ') Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Dr. Gawande, M.D., M.P.H. / The New Yorker, PBS Newshour, 07-Sep-2020.

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 11:37:00 AM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, September 7, 2020 3:43 PM

Subject: Dr. Gawande, M.D., M.P.H. / The New Yorker, PBS Newshour, 07-Sep-2020.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dr. Gawande, M.D., M.P.H.,

Today on the PBS Newshour you praised Dr. Grant Colfax for San Francisco's ability to remain relatively low in coronavirus positivity test rates.

However, as two UCSF scientists expressed in an LA Times OP Ed (https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-08-16/coronavirus-cases-california-inequality), the San Francisco County positivity rate is currently 2.6% overall but intra-county positivity rates are as high as 9% in some socio-economic containment-zone neighborhoods.

Dr. Grant Colfax, Chief of the San Francisco Department of Public Health, has refused and ignored community requests for more granular and ACTIONABLE intra-county test data that might allow prevention of community spread in neighborhoods with crowded congregate care living settings which are also workplaces.

I look forward to seeing if all Harvard-associated M.D.'s/M.P.H.'s ignore lay correspondence or if it is just Dr. Colfax here in San Francisco. I know how busy you are schlepping your solutions in The New Yorker and speaking on the PBS Newshour about community mitigation efforts in communities like San Francisco that you are highly ignorant of. Get informed before you speak. Didn't they teach you that at Harvard?

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

RJ Sloan

(415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://youtu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

Meet Chaka and Ebony, post-re-entry. And baby makes a family. -- TED Radio Hour: NPR

Safe NPR Radio Link: https://www.npr.org/programs/ted-radio-hour/904356771/finding-another-way

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Union Square Community Benefit District Serves White Corporate Luxury Brands, NOT BLACK UNHOUSED

LIVES or Veteran"s Murals in Veterans Alley.

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 1:43:00 PM

From: rjsloan <<u>rjsloan@yahoo.com</u>>

Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:21 PM

To: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) aaron.peskin@sfgov.org;

Haney, Matt (BOS) < matt.haney@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) < board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS)

<sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS)

<shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Kevin F. Adler

< kevin@miraclemessages.org>; Amos Gregory Veterans Alley < veteransalley@gmail.com>

Subject: FW: Union Square Community Benefit District Serves White Corporate Luxury Brands, NOT BLACK UNHOUSED LIVES or Veteran's Murals in Veterans Alley.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Budget Sub-Committee Supervisors et. al.,

Ms. Flood of Union Square BID attempted today to hijack the compassionate non-profit mission of Ted Talker, successful Tech Entrepreneur Kevin Adler. Miracle Messages non-profit founded by Mr. Adler (who grew up in Livermore) connects volunteers with the unhoused via donated dumbphones to the currently unhoused. He's recently piloted a social/emotional remote-volunteer support program for the newly housed living in San Francisco supportive housing settings.

[Mr. Adler's 6 minute Ted Talk safe link can be found here: https://youtu.be/MRcJu8VriHk]

SFPD/Sherriff oversight isn't optional for white corporate luxury brand Union Square retailers or landowners. Especially when the same hires 24/7 non-community 'hire-a-cop' Private Security patrols who roust the Black unhoused at 3AM with regularity. USBID has simultaneously treated the Black unhoused disdainfully and PAINTED OVER, removing BLACK and BROWN post-war HISTORY.

Veterans' 'Trauma-Informed' public Art murals are a "treasure," according to San Francisco District 6 Supervisor Matt Haney.

These outdoor Art murals painted by U.S. Veterans can be experienced suddenly in and around the edges of District 6 including Shannon Way, A.K.A. 'Veteran's Alley.' Veteran's Alley was founded by and is led by Artist/Muralist/Community Leader Amos Gregory (who I've copied on this informational correspondence with the SFBOS Budget Subcommittee).

PLEASE ADVISE.

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

----- Original message -----

From: rjsloan <<u>rjsloan@yahoo.com</u>> Date: 9/3/20 10:50 AM (GMT-08:00)

To: "Kevin F. Adler" < kevin@miraclemessages.org>

Cc: Matt Haney Office <<u>matt.haney@sfgov.org</u>>, Supervisor Peskin <<u>Peskinstaff@sfgov.org</u>> Subject: Union Square Community Benefit District Serves White Corporate Luxury Brands, NOT

BLACK UNHOUSED LIVES or Veteran's Murals in Veterans Alley.

Kevin,

I'm on call with the SFBIS Budget Committee about to weigh in on Union Square CBD. Representative Flood is using Miracle Messages non-profit photos for her specious presentation.

Here is what you should know are my talking points:

- --Union Square CBD being assholes and serving white corporate luxury brands?
- --Allowing Homeland Security to view live camera streams AGAINST local oversight rules?
- --Painting over trauma-informed Veteran Art?

Please advise.

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Tenderloin Sidewalks Paved With Gold? Dream the Dream.

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 1:20:00 PM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 10:54 PM

To: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>

<andy.lynch@sfgov.org>

Subject: Tenderloin Sidewalks Paved With Gold? Dream the Dream.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

Tens of thousands flock to our shores annually. For generations immigrants have been told that they can live the American Dream once they finally arrive. Let's meet immigrants halfway.

For a Tenderloin Community Center, won't you commit to the long-term funding that will allow us to pave our sidewalks with GOLD?

To live the American Dream, immigrant families must feel welcomed to our shores. They must each be allowed to get on their feet.

Please consider a permanent piece of City Real Estate to devote to the Tenderloin Community Center in order to welcome our newest community members.

And to pave the Tenderloin sidewalks with gold.

Respectfully,

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://voutu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Tenderloin/SOMA, Bayview, Chinatown Neighborhoods Must Model Latino Task Force/UCSF Coronavirus

ACTIONABLE Data Reporting Collaboration to STOP FURTHER LOCAL ECONOMIC DAMAGE.

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 1:20:00 PM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, September 5, 2020 9:05 PM

To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) < Grant.Colfax@sfdph.org>

Cc: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary

<hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Stephanie <stephanie.cohen@sfdph.org>; DPH-DOC Data Request <DPH.DOC.DataRequest@sfdph.org>; Lao, Selina (UCSF) <Selina.Lao@ucsf.edu>; Bibbins-Domingo, Kirsten (UCSF) <kirsten.bibbins-domingo@ucsf.edu>; Kushel, Margot (UCSF) <margot.kushel@ucsf.edu>

Subject: Tenderloin/SOMA, Bayview, Chinatown Neighborhoods Must Model Latino Task Force/UCSF Coronavirus ACTIONABLE Data Reporting Collaboration to STOP FURTHER LOCAL FCONOMIC DAMAGE.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dr. Grant Colfax, M.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health 101 Grove Street San Francisco. CA. 94102

Dr. Colfax,

The AIDS pandemic, upon reflection, was a body-fluid viral pandemic. Your participation during a previous era of a deadly public health crisis has not given you the bone fides required **for San Francisco** to become a global coronavirus mitigation leader. Airborne disease community spread is a very different monster as those of us lay people are understanding, without your Harvard credentials.

Please release coronavirus positivity rates, CT spread values and contact tracing efficacy data BY TESTING SITE to the public in order to allow community activists to be informed of intra-county disparities in viral health damage impacts in our various communities including communities of color and essential workers.

Safe Media Link:

https://missionlocal.org/2020/09/a-carnaval-celebration-for-a-pandemic-covid-19-tests-a-food-pantry-and-even-a-bit-of-dancing/

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://youtu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Harvard Dr. J. Figueroa, M.D., M.P.H. Rushes Out Paper Reporting on Covid-19 Disparities in Communities of

Color. -- Crowded Housing, Restaurant Work, Fear of Public Charge Immigration Rule Implicated.

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 1:21:00 PM

Attachments: 27-Aug-2020 Harvard Covid DisproportionateImpact.pdf

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2020 9:48 AM

To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) < Grant.Colfax@sfdph.org>

Cc: Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary

<hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Stephanie <stephanie.cohen@sfdph.org>; DPH-DOC Data Request <DPH.DOC.DataRequest@sfdph.org>; Lao, Selina (UCSF) <Selina.Lao@ucsf.edu>; Bibbins-Domingo, Kirsten (UCSF) <kirsten.bibbins-domingo@ucsf.edu>; Kushel, Margot (UCSF) <margot.kushel@ucsf.edu>

Subject: Harvard Dr. J. Figueroa, M.D., M.P.H. Rushes Out Paper Reporting on Covid-19 Disparities in Communities of Color. -- Crowded Housing, Restaurant Work, Fear of Public Charge Immigration Rule Implicated.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dr. Colfax, M.D., Director,San Francisco Department of Public Health 101 Grove Street San Francisco, CA 94102

Dr. Colfax,

Please reference the recently fast tracked Health Affairs article outlining community-level factors associated with Covid-19 racial and ethnic disparities in Massachusetts. The ATTACHED peer-reviewed paper is published by Dr. Jose Figueroa, M.D., M.P.H., et. al..

Crowded housing, food-service work and the fear of ramifications of the Federal Public Charge rule all operate in concert to disproportionately impact socio-economically disadvantaged individuals and their families and friends within particular neighborhoods and congregate housing settings.

Please have Dr. Cohen reach out to me to discuss my repeated requests for ACTIONABLE neighborhood coronavirus testing-site data, among other reporting matters.

A 7-minute NPR Sunday Morning Edition Interview with Dr. Figueroa can be listened to here:

https://www.npr.org/2020/09/06/910194836/harvard-researcher-discusses-why-covid-19-is-devastating-communities-of-color

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://youtu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

----- Original message -----

From: rjsloan <<u>rjsloan@yahoo.com</u>> Date: 9/5/20 9:05 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: Grant Colfax < grant.colfax@sfdph.org >

Cc: Mayor London Breed <<u>mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org</u>>, SFBOS REMOTE CALL IN <<u>BOS@sfgov.org</u>>, Matt Haney Office <<u>matt.haney@sfgov.org</u>>, Supervisor Ronen <<u>Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org</u>>, Supervisor Peskin <<u>aaron.peskin@sfgov.org</u>>, Supervisor Walton <<u>shamann.walton@sfgov.org</u>>, SFDPH Stephanie Cohen <<u>Stephanie.Cohen@sfdph.org</u>>, SF DPH

<DPH.DOC.DataRequest@sfdph.org>, UCSF Covid Outreach <<u>Selina.Lao@ucsf.edu</u>>, <u>kirsten.bibbins-domingo@ucsf.edu</u>, <u>margot.kushel@ucsf.edu</u>

Subject: Tenderloin/SOMA, Bayview, Chinatown Neighborhoods Must Model Latino Task Force/UCSF Coronavirus ACTIONABLE Data Reporting Collaboration to STOP FURTHER LOCAL ECONOMIC DAMAGE.

Dr. Grant Colfax, M.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health 101 Grove Street San Francisco, CA. 94102

Dr. Colfax,

The AIDS pandemic, upon reflection, was a body-fluid viral pandemic. Your participation during a previous era of a deadly public health crisis has not given you the bone fides required **for San Francisco** to become a global coronavirus mitigation leader. Airborne disease community spread is a very different monster as those of us lay people are understanding, without your Harvard credentials.

Please release coronavirus positivity rates, CT spread values and contact tracing efficacy data BY TESTING SITE to the public in order to allow community activists to be informed of intra-county disparities in viral health damage impacts in our various communities including communities of color and essential workers.

Safe Media Link:

 $\frac{https://missionlocal.org/2020/09/a-carnaval-celebration-for-a-pandemic-covid-19-tests-a-food-pantry-and-even-a-bit-of-dancing/$

RJ Sloan (415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://youtu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

By Jose F. Figueroa, Rishi K. Wadhera, Dennis Lee, Robert W. Yeh, and Benjamin D. Sommers

Community-Level Factors Associated With Racial And Ethnic Disparities In COVID-19 Rates In Massachusetts

DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01040 HEALTH AFFAIRS 39, NO. 11 (2020): -©2020 Project HOPE— The People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc.

ABSTRACT Massachusetts has one of the highest cumulative incidence rates of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases in the US. Understanding which specific demographic, economic, and occupational factors have contributed to disparities of COVID-19 is critical to inform public health strategies. We performed a cross-sectional study of 351 Massachusetts towns/cities (01/01/2020-05/06/2020) and found that a 10 percentage point increase in the Black population was associated with a 312.3 increase in COVID-19 cases per 100,000, while a 10 percentage point increase in the Latino population was associated with an increase of 258.2 cases per 100,000. Independent predictors of higher COVID-19 rates included the proportion of foreign-born non-citizens living in a community, mean household size, and share of food service workers. After adjustment for these variables, the association between the Latino population and COVID-19 rates was attenuated. In contrast, the association between the Black population and COVID-19 rates persisted, and may be explained by other systemic inequities. Public health and policy efforts that improve care for foreign born non-citizens, address crowded housing, and protect food-service workers may help mitigate the spread of COVID-19 among minority communities. [Editor's Note: This Fast Track Ahead Of Print article is the accepted version of the peer-reviewed manuscript. The final edited version will appear in an upcoming issue of Health Affairs.]

Jose F. Figueroa (jfigueroa@ hsph.harvard.edu) is an assistant professor of health policy and management, Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, in Boston, Massachusetts.

Rishi K. Wadhera is an instructor in medicine, Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, in Boston, Massachusetts.

Dennis Lee is a research assistant, Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health.

Robert W. Yeh is an associate professor of medicine, Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center.

Benjamin D. Sommers is a professor of health policy and economics, Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health.

he United States is now the epicenter of the global coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Massachusetts had one of the highest case and death rates in the country for much of the spring, ¹ and early reports suggest that Black and Latino persons are being disproportionately affected, similar to patterns observed in other states. ²⁻⁴ In response to the unequal burden of the disease, Massachusetts lawmakers recently passed Bill H.4672, ⁵ which aims to understand the racial and ethnic health inequities that have emerged amid the pandemic.

Although Black and Latino communities in

Massachusetts have shouldered a larger burden of COVID-19,^{2,4} evidence regarding the community-level factors that may be contributing to these disparities remains sparse. Furthermore, because most data collected by Departments of Health focus on only a few demographic factors such as age, sex, and race/ethnicity, there has been a paucity of objective data on whether COVID-19 cases are characterized by disparities along other important dimensions. There is growing concern, for example, that lower-income and Black and Latino persons may be at greater risk of exposure to COVID-19 because they are more likely to be essential workers,

and also tend to live in densely-populated areas and multigenerational households. Among immigrant communities, there are reports of foreign born non-citizens avoiding care (including testing and advice regarding COVID-19-like symptoms) for fear of deportation or risking their future legal resident status based on new federal "public charge" regulations. 10

Finally, long-standing historical inequities and structural racism, which have led to adverse outcomes including residential segregation and differences in access to health care, may also contribute to these disparities. ¹¹⁻¹³ Therefore, an understanding of the factors leading to increased case rates among minority communities is urgently needed to inform strategies to mitigate the ongoing spread of the disease.

This study has two key objectives. First, we sought to characterize the association between the proportion of Black or Latino persons and COVID-19 cases in cities and towns across Massachusetts. Second, we evaluated what other demographic, occupational, and economic factors are associated with elevated community risk for COVID-19, and which of these factors—if any—are contributing to potential racial and ethnic disparities.

Study Data And Methods

DATA SOURCES The Massachusetts Department of Public Health database, which is publicly available on the Mass.gov website, was used to obtain the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases per 100,000 residents by city or town between January 1, 2020 to May 6, 2020. The state has released exact counts of confirmed cases for most towns, including those with 0 cases, but it censors values for towns with between 1 and 4 total cases and simply reports "<5 cases"; for these towns (representing 0.8% of our weighted sample), we imputed the absolute rate at the median of this range at 2.5, and divided by the population total to convert to a rate per 100,000.

The 2013–2018 American Community Survey was used to obtain demographic, economic, and occupational variables at the city and town level. The primary variables of interest were the proportions of people in one of four mutually-exclusive racial/ethnic groups (based on self-report): Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (referred to as Latino for brevity); Black non-Latino; White non-Latino; and Other non-Latino (approximately 70% of whom are Asian-American or Pacific Islander). Other demographic, economic, and occupational variables at the community-level were total population; average age; average household size; median household income; and the proportions of people who were age 60 years

or older, male, were employed as essential workers, were foreign-born non-citizens, and completed less than a high school degree. Most foreign-born non-citizens in Massachusetts are from Latin America (44.9%), Asia (30.7%), Europe (13.9%), and Africa (7.5%).¹⁵

We classified employed residents into essential workers and non-essential workers based on the state's classification in the governor's March 2020 emergency order. ¹⁶ The following occupations were defined as essential: health care practitioners, technical occupations, and support services; construction and extraction; installation, maintenance, and repair; material moving occupation; production services; transportation; building and grounds cleaning and maintenance; food preparation and serving-related occupation; personal care and service occupation; and protective services.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS We categorized cities and towns in our sample into quartiles based on the proportion of Black residents, and then analyzed population-weighted descriptive statistics. We repeated this based on the proportion of Latino residents.

Next, we estimated linear regression models to assess the association between the proportions of each racial/ethnic group with the number of COVID-19 cases per 100,000 people in each city or town. Models were weighted by the population size of each town. We first performed a series of univariate analyses using each demographic, economic, and occupational variable as a predictor with COVID-19 case rates as the dependent variable. Analyses that focused on a specific race/ethnicity (e.g. proportion Black residents) as a predictor adjusted for the proportion of other racial/ethnic minority residents in a town (e.g. proportion Latino, proportion other non-Latino). Then, we performed multivariable linear regression to assess what factors were independently associated with differences COVID19 case rates, and which of those factors if any-attenuated the observed racial/ethnic disparities after adjustment. We present two versions of the multivariable model—first, using natural units for each covariate (e.g. proportion of people by race/ethnicity, foreign-born noncitizens, essential workers, over age 60 years old, and those with less than a high school education; number of people for household size; dollars for median income; total number of people in city or town); and second using normalized z-scores, which enable an apples-to-apples comparison of the strength of the associations for a one-standard deviation increase in each covariate.

Several sensitivity analyses were performed. Since the "essential occupations" designation aggregates a heterogeneous set of jobs that likely

have different levels of risk, we tested a model that separately identified the three most common categories of essential work in our sample—healthcare-related, food services, and construction/extraction jobs.

To examine whether our results were being driven by a small number of large population areas (particularly Boston), we performed sensitivity analyses with multivariable regression models limited to the top 50 largest towns and cities, and separately, limited to the smaller towns (all other towns not in the top 50). All analyses were repeated using the logarithm of the COVID-19 rate as the outcome, and we also tested using the log of average household income as a covariate. We also tested whether excluding towns with censored COVID rates between 1 and 4 affected our results.

In addition, because data on deaths at the city/town level are not publicly available, we performed county-level analyses to assess the association between proportion of Black or Latino population and the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases and deaths per 100,000 population within a county. We also assessed the correlation between COVID-19 case rates and COVID-19 death rates within counties.¹⁴

The Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Institutional Review Board deemed this study non-human-subjects research given the use of aggregated publicly available data. Analysis was performed using STATA Version 14.0.

LIMITATIONS There are important limitations to this study. First, in Massachusetts—as in most states and localities to our knowledge-individual-level data by race/ethnicity and other demographic, economic, and occupational variables are not currently publicly available. Since our analysis focused on community-level variables, these population-level findings may be subject to ecological fallacy. However, the broad pattern of our findings on race/ethnicity match closely the individual-level disparities evident in other patient-level data sources. 17,18 Moreover, in the absence of individual-level demographic, economic, and occupational data, our evaluation of these factors at the level of the city of town provides the most granular level of analysis currently possible, and improves considerably over county or state-based analyses.

Second, although Massachusetts is a COVID-19 "hot-spot," these findings may not be generalizable to other U.S. states. While our single-state study may limit its generalizability, there is wide variation across states in testing availability and guidelines, which may bias rates of confirmed COVID-19. Therefore, this analysis's focus on a single state likely improved its internal validity to assess the predictors of COVID-19 case

rates. In addition, Massachusetts has the fourth highest median income of any state and the highest level of health coverage in the nation, ^{20,21} though it is unclear whether insurance coverage has any mitigating effect on rates of COVID-19 transmission and disparities.

Third, we focused on confirmed COVID-19 cases, since town and city COVID-19 death rates are not publicly available. Our county level analysis indicates that COVID-19 case rates and deaths rates were highly correlated, suggesting the pattern seen here for cases is likely similar for death rates. Unlike death rates, however, variation in cases could potentially be affected by differences in testing patterns across localities or other sociodemographic factors. Given known disparities in health care access and COVID-19 testing availability, the communities that we identified as being at higher risk for COVID-19 may-if anything-be less likely to receive adequate testing, 19,22 which suggests that our results likely underestimate disparities in case rates. Finally, underlying differences in comorbidities across minority groups were not captured in our study; however, this would be more likely to affect disparities in death rates rather than case rates.

Study Results

CHARACTERISTICS OF TOWNS AND CITIES All 351 towns and cities in Massachusetts were included in the analysis. Towns with a higher proportion of Black residents and Latino residents had larger populations on average, fewer high school graduates, lower median incomes, younger residents, and more foreign-born non-citizens than towns with fewer minorities (online supplemental exhibit 1).23 Average household size was slightly smaller among high-Latino and high-Black communities compared to other communities (2.5 vs. 2.6). The proportion of people working in essential service occupations was higher among high-Black and high-Latino communities, including food and service preparation and building, grounds cleaning and maintenance services.

RACE/ETHNICITY Towns with a higher proportion of Black residents or Latino residents generally had a higher number of COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population (supplemental exhibits 2 and 3).²³ Notably, the state's 5 towns with the highest COVID-19 rates are all majorityminority, including Chelsea, which has a population that is two-thirds Latino and has the highest confirmed infection rate in the state—nearly 6 times higher than the state average.²⁴

In the unadjusted analyses of race/ethnicity (with White non-Latino the omitted group), a

10 percentage point increase in the Black population was associated with an increase of 312.3 [95% CI 241.9 to 383.0, p < 0.001] cases per 100,000 (supplemental exhibit 4).²³ A 10 percentage point increase in the Latino population was associated with an increase of 258.2 [95% CI 217.0 to 300.3, p < 0.001] cases per 100,000, while a 10 percentage point increase in the Other non-Latino population was associated with an increase of 86.5 [95% CI 7.2 to 169.9, p = 0.03] cases per 100,000.

After multivariable adjustment, the association between the Black population and case rates persisted with a 10 percentage point higher population associated with an additional 307.2 cases [95% CI 219.6 to 394.7, p < 0.001] per 100,000. In contrast, the association between the Latino population and case rates was substantially attenuated and no longer statistically significant (50.4, [95% CI -19.0 to 119.8], p = 0.15). Meanwhile, after adjustment, the association between the proportion of Other non-Latino race and case rates became significantly negative (-216.4, [95% CI -321.4 to -111.3], p < 0.001).

DEMOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND OTHER FAC-**TORS** Several factors were significantly associated with higher COVID-19 case rates across towns and cities in unadjusted models: higher average household size; and larger shares of essential workers, foreign-born non-citizens, and nonhigh school graduates. After multivariable adjustment, mean household size and proportion of foreign-born non-citizens were still independently associated with higher COVID-19 rates. The model using normalized values for these covariates showed that the largest absolute risk factor was the share of foreign-born non-citizens (310.4 per standard deviation, 95% CI 253.5 to 367.2) and then mean household size (236.4 per SD, 95% CI 131.9 to 340.9). Older age was also associated with additional cases while larger population size was associated with slightly fewer cases but both were weaker predictors.

Although the overall proportion of essential service workers was no longer associated with case rates in our multivariable analysis, an exploratory analysis of the three most common occupations found that employment in food service was significantly associated with higher case rates (71.4 per standard deviation, 95% CI 7.2 to 135.7) (appendix exhibit 1).²³

SENSITIVITY ANALYSES We observed a similar association between race/ethnicity and COVID-19 case rates in the multivariable analysis when we stratified the sample into the largest 50 towns and cities and all other (smaller) towns (appendix exhibit 2).²³ The proportion of foreign-born non-citizens remained the strongest predictor of case rates in the largest towns and cities, while in

smaller towns, a larger mean household size was significantly associated with higher case rates. Results were generally similar using the logarithm of the COVID-19 case rate as an outcome, when excluding towns with censored values for cases between 1 and 4 individuals, when excluding Boston from the sample, and when measuring income using the logarithm of average household income (data not reported).

We also performed additional county-level analyses and found that a higher proportion of Black or Latino residents within a county was associated with a significant increase in county-level cases and deaths (appendix exhibits 3 and 4).²³ There was also a strong positive correlation between the number of county-level cases and county-level deaths (Pearson's coefficient, 0.82, p < 0.001) (appendix exhibit 5).²³

Discussion

Across Massachusetts' cities and towns, Latino and Black communities are experiencing much higher rates of COVID-19 cases. Several factors measured in our data (foreign-born non-citizen status, household size, and job type) appear to explain the higher COVID-19 case rates among Latino communities in Massachusetts. It appears that these factors may not be the primary reason for higher case rates in Black communities.

While the extent of racial and ethnic disparities has already been documented, 25-27 our study identifies important factors that are independently associated with higher COVID-19 case rates in the state. The proportion of foreign-born non-citizens was the strongest predictor of the burden of COVID-19 cases within a community, and in Massachusetts, this population includes sizable numbers of both Latin American (44.9%) and Asian individuals (30.7%).15 Furthermore, under the Trump Administration's revised "Public Charge" Rule, which took effect in early 2020, lawfully present immigrants who use public benefits from local, state, or federal governments may be at risk of being denied permanent residency status. Although the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services website now encourages immigrants to seek care for COVID-19-like symptoms, enrollment in Medicaid at the time of COVID-19-related care may still be used in the Public Charge analysis.²⁸ Recent studies suggest that immigrant families have strong incentives not to enroll in public health insurance like Medicaid and may avoid seeking medical care if they develop COVID-19-like symptoms and require testing. 10 In the absence of a positive test, these individuals are less likely to isolate and quarantine, which may impede public health efforts to control the spread of COVID-19.^{29,30}

These issues are likely only magnified by the fact that immigrants tend to live in larger households, which we also found to be an independent predictor of COVID-19 case rates. Policy approaches that reduce barriers to accessing medical care for immigrant populations and that address crowded housing—particularly when individuals have tested positive and need to be isolated—could be important avenues for reducing disparities and slowing the spread of infection.

Our work also sheds important insights into the factors that may be contributing to the higher rates of COVID-19 cases among Latino communities. As noted above, many immigrants in the Latino community may be deferring necessary care for fear of risking citizenship under the Public Charge rule or possible deportation. In addition, Latino persons tend to be disproportionately employed in essential services that are public facing, particularly in the food service industry, which we found to be associated with higher COVID-19 rates. As the state moves to cautiously re-open more businesses, greater worker protections to reduce potential exposures may be needed in these jobs. Many lowincome minority workers also do not have the luxury of working from home,25 and less than half of Latino workers in the U.S. have jobs with paid sick leave.32 While Congress recently expanded the availability of paid sick leave under the CARES Act in March 2020, the law exempted workers in large firms and health care organizations, which may leave many essential workers unprotected if they contract COVID-19.33

Meanwhile, our results show large disparities in infection rates associated with Black communities, but these disparities do not appear to be primarily explained by the factors that we examined. Other factors not examined in this study may explain the disparate impact of COVID-19 in Black communities. Structural inequities, such as disproportionately high incarceration rates, such a serious in areas with a higher concentration of multiunit residential buildings, and de facto neighborhood segregation, which may lead to disparities in health care access and great-

er exposure to environmental hazards, may contribute to the spread of COVID-19 in these communities. Transportation use may also increase the risk of exposure to COVID-19, as Black workers are more likely to use public transit to commute to work.³⁶

Evidence emerging from other U.S. cities and states has similarly described that Black and Latino populations are being disproportionately affected by COVID-19.3,25,26 In addition, preliminary work from Massachusetts suggests that these populations also have substantially higher death rates.³⁷ Our study expands upon these findings in several ways. We identify important factors (proportion of foreign-born non-citizens in a community, household size, food service occupation) that are strongly associated with the risk of developing COVID-19. In addition, we characterize the extent to which these factors, among others, may be contributing to the higher number of COVID-19 cases in Black and Latino communities. Because we evaluate each of these unique populations separately, we find that some factors, such as occupation in an essential service field, may not affect Black and Latino communities in a similar manner. Our findings provide important insights that may inform and help tailor public health and policy strategies to address the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Conclusion

Across Massachusetts cities and towns, significant COVID-19 disparities are evident along multiple dimensions-particularly race/ethnicity, foreign-born non-citizen status, household size, and job type. Higher proportions of Black or Latino residents within a community was significantly associated with higher rates of COVID-19 cases. The factors examined in our study explained this relationship for Latino communities but did not appear to explain the higher rates among black communities. Further research into the social and economic factors underlying COVID-19-related disparities and new policies to address risk factors and institutional racism will be critical to controlling the epidemic and improving health equity.

This work was partially funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Policies for Action. Jose Figueroa reports receiving grants from the Commonwealth Fund and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for other work unrelated to this project. Rishi Wadhera reported receiving research support from the National Heart, Lung, and

Blood Institute (grant K23HL148525-1) and previously serving as a consultant for Regeneron. Robert Yeh reported receiving research support from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (grant R01HL136708); serving as a consultant to Biosense Webster; and serving as a consultant to and receiving grants from Abbott Vascular,

AstraZeneca, Boston Scientific, and Medtronic. Benjamin Sommers reported receiving funding from the Commonwealth Fund, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the National Institutes of Health (R01MD014970). [Published online August 27, 2020.]

NOTES

- 1 Coronavirus Resource Center. Coronavirus COVID-19 global cases [Internet]. Baltimore (MD): Center for Systems Science and Engineering, Johns Hopkins University and Medicine; 2020 [cited 2020 April 1]. Available from: https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html
- 2 Boston Public Health Commission. Boston COVID-19 report—Weekly report [Internet]. Boston (MA); 2020 [cited 2020 May 9]. Available from: https://bphc.org/whatwedo/ infectious-diseases/Documents/ COVID19%20Boston%20Report_ 2020_Week16.pdf
- **3** Wadhera RK, Wadhera P, Gaba P, Figueroa JF, Joynt Maddox KE, Yeh RW. Variation in COVID-19 hospitalizations and deaths across New York City boroughs. JAMA. 2020; 323(21):2192–5.
- 4 Massachusetts Department of Public Health. COVID-19 dashboard [Internet]. Boston (MA): Mass.gov; 2020 May [cited 2020 May 10]. Available from: https://www.mass.gov/doc/ covid-19-dashboard-may-10-2020/ download
- 5 An act addressing COVID-19 data collection and disparities in treatment. Bill No. H.4672. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 191st Session 2020.
- 6 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Health equity considerations and racial and ethnic minority groups [Internet]. Atlanta (GA): CDC; 2020 [cited 2020 May 5]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/racial-ethnic-minorities.html
- 7 Lofquist DA. Multigenerational households: 2009–2011 [Internet]. Washington (DC): US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau; 2012 Oct [cited 2020 May 10]. (Report No. ACSBR/11-03). Available from: https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2012/acs/acsbr11-03.html
- 8 ACLU Massachusetts. Data show COVID-19 is hitting essential workers and people of color hardest [Internet]. Boston (MA): ACLU Massachusetts; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 May 5]. Available from: https://www.aclum.org/en/publications/data-show-covid-19-hitting-essential-workers-and-people-color-hardest
- 9 Bernstein H, Gonzalez D, Karpman M, Zuckerman S. One in seven adults in immigrant families reported avoiding public benefit programs in 2018 [Internet]. Washington (DC): Urban Institute; 2019 [cited 2020 May 10]. Available from: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/one-sevenadults-immigrant-families-reported-

- avoiding-public-benefit-programs-2018#:~:text=About%20one%20in %20seven%20adults,adults%20in %20low%2Dincome%20immigrant
- 10 Sommers BD, Allen H, Bhanja A, Blendon RJ, Orav EJ, Epstein AM. Assessment of perceptions of the public charge rule among lowincome adults in Texas. JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(7):e2010391.
- 11 Kijakazi K. COVID-19 racial and health disparities highlight why we need to address structural racism [Internet]. Washington (DC): Urban Institute; 2020 Apr 10 [cited 2020 May 10]. Available from: https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/covid-19-racial-health-disparities-highlight-why-we-need-address-structural-racism
- 12 Chowkwanyun M, Reed AL. Racial health disparities and Covid-19—Caution and context. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(3):201–3.
- 13 Boyd RW, Lindo EG, Weeks LD, McLemore MR. On racism: A new standard for publishing racial health inequities. Health Affairs Blog [blog on the Internet]. 2020 Jul 2 [cited 2020 May 9]. Available from: https://www.healthaffairs.org/do/ 10.1377/hblog20200630.939347/ full/
- 14 Commonwealth of Massachusetts. COVID-19 response reporting [Internet]. Boston (MA): Commonwealth of Massachusetts; 2020 [cited 2020 May 9]. Available from: https://www.mass.gov/info-details/covid-19-response-reporting
- 15 Census Bureau. American Community Survey Data [Internet]. Washington DC: Census Bureau; 2020 [cited 2020 May 9]. Available from: https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html
- 16 Commonwealth of Massachusetts. COVID-19: Essential services [Internet]. Boston (MA): Commonwealth of Massachusetts; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 May 19]. Available from: https://www.mass.gov/info-details/covid-19-essential-services
- 17 Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area. JAMA. 2020;323(20):2052-9.
- 18 Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. Hospitalization and mortality among black patients and white patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(26):2534–43.
- 19 Rader B, Astley CM, Sy KTL, Sewalk K, Hswen Y, Brownstein JS, et al. Geographic access to United States SARS-CoV-2 testing sites highlights healthcare disparities and may bias transmission estimates. J Travel Med. 2020 May 15:taa076.

- 20 Figueroa JF, Zheng J, Orav EJ, Epstein AM, Jha AK. Medicare program associated with narrowing hospital readmission disparities between black and white patients. Health Aff (Millwood). 2018;37(4): 654–61.
- 21 Kaiser Family Foundation. Health insurance coverage of the total population [Internet]. San Francisco (CA): Kaiser Family Foundation; 2020 Jul 22 [cited 2020 July 26, 2020]. (State Health Facts). Available from: https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/total-population/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22: %22Location%22,%22sort%22: %22asc%22%7D#notes
- 22 Kim SR, Vann M, Bronner L,
 Manthey G. Want a COVID test? It's
 much easier to get in wealthier,
 whiter neighborhoods [Internet].
 New York (NY): FiveThirtyEight;
 2020 Jul 22 [cited 2020 July 24,
 2020]. Available from: https://five
 thirtyeight.com/features/whiteneighborhoods-have-more-accessto-covid-19-testing-sites/
- **23** To access the appendix, click on the Details tab of the article online.
- 24 Del Real JA. In an immigrant community battling coronavirus, "essential" means "vulnerable."
 Washington Post [serial on the Internet]. 2020 May 9 [cited 2020 May 18]. Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/inan-immigrant-community-battling-coronavirus-essential-means-vulnerable/2020/05/08/c25cdb4e-8e1e-11ea-a9c0-73b93422d691_story.html
- **25** Webb Hooper M, Napoles AM, Perez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and racial/ethnic disparities. JAMA. 2020;323(24):2466–7.
- **26** Yancy CW. COVID-19 and African Americans. JAMA. 2020;323(19): 1891–2.
- **27** Owen WF Jr., Carmona R, Pomeroy C. Failing another national stress test on health disparities. JAMA. 2020;323(19):1905–6.
- 28 Immigration and Compliance Briefing: COVID-19 summary of government relief and potential "Public Charge Rule" impact on nonimmigrant and immigrant Visa applications. National Law Review [serial on the Internet]. 2020 May 12 [cited 2020 May 18]. Available from: https://www.natlawreview.com/article/immigration-and-compliance-briefing-covid-19-summary-government-relief-and-potential
- 29 Perreira KM, Yoshikawa H,
 Oberlander J. A new threat to immigrants' health—The Public-Charge rule. N Engl J Med. 2018;379(10): 901–3.
- 30 Page KR, Venkataramani M, Beyrer

- C, Polk S. Undocumented U.S. immigrants and Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:e62.
- 31 Taylor P, Kochhar R, Cohn D, Passel JS, Velasco G, Motel S, Patten E. Fighting poverty in a tough economy, Americans move in with their relatives [Internet]. Washington (DC): Pew Research Center; 2011. Chapter 3, Demographics of multigenerational households; [cited 2020 May 18]. Available from: https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/10/03/chapter-3-demographics-of-multi-generational-households/#native-born-and-foreign-born
- 32 Institute for Women's Policy Research. Paid sick days access and usage rates vary by race/ethnicity, occupation, and earnings.
 Washington (DC): IWPR; 2016 Feb.
- 33 Sommers BD, Coburn BE. Prescrib-

- ing paid sick leave—An important tool for primary care in the epidemic. JAMA Health Forum. 2020;324(4):324–5.
- 34 Gramlich J. The gap between the number of blacks and whites in prison is shrinking [Internet]. Washington (DC): Pew Research Center; 2019 Apr 30 [cited 2020 Aug 19]. Available from: https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/30/shrinking-gap-betweennumber-of-blacks-and-whites-inprison/
- 35 Census Bureau. American Housing Survey [Internet]. Washington (DC): Census Bureau; 2020 [cited 2020 May 15]. Available from: https:// www.census.gov/programs-surveys/ ahs/data.html
- **36** Anderson M. Who relies on public transit in the U.S [Internet]. Washington (DC): Pew Research

- Center; 2016 Apr [cited 2020 May 14]. Available from: https://www .pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/07/who-relies-on-public-transit-in-the-u-s/
- 37 Chen JT, Waterman PD, Krieger N. COVID-19 and the unequal surge in mortality rates in Massachusetts, by city/town and ZIP Code measures of poverty, household crowing, race/ ethnicity, and racialized economic segregation [Internet]. Boston (MA): Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies; 2020 May [cited 2020 May 14]. (Working Paper Vol. 19, No. 2). Available from: https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/1266/2020/ 05/20_jtc_pdw_nk_COVID19_MAexcess-mortality_text_tables_ figures_final_0509_with-cover-1 .pdf

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Harm-Reduction Isn"t Trauma Informed Care. City Millions to Supportive Housing Non-profits Must Return

More "Impact on Investment."

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 1:21:00 PM

From: rjsloan <rjsloan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2020 1:34 PM

To: Heather Knight SF Chronicle <hknight@sfchronicle.com>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>

Subject: Harm-Reduction Isn't Trauma Informed Care. City Millions to Supportive Housing Non-profits Must Return More 'Impact on Investment.'

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Knight,

In response to your piece on Tenderloin open-air drug dealing, Supportive Housing non-profit's must drastically improve the impact of Case Management staff and leadership on the painful lives of the addicted in their care.

Harm-reduction doesn't mean take City millions annually and call your laissez faire approach to client addiction 'harm-reduction' or 'trauma informed care.'

"Housing is Healthcare" does NOT mean Case Management staff at SRO hotels collectively take no action on fentanyl as de facto 'trauma-informed' healing.

Supportive Housing clients create demand for illicit, street-level drug-dealing. Let's focus on the demand side of the street level illicit drug interaction. The Nixon-era 'War on Drugs" policies failed.

Safe Media Link:

https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/heatherknight/article/Tenderloin-tents-are-now-rare-Open-air-drug-15544410.php?utm_campaign=CMS%20Sharing%20Tools%20(Premium)&utm_source=shar

RJ Sloan

(415) 465-3261 (Texts Preferred, No Voicemail) RJSLOAN@YAHOO.COM

"God Speaks Through the Insane." -- Anonymous

Anita Baker "Giving You the Best That I Got" Safe YouTube Media Link:

https://youtu.be/rUSddpvB4X0

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: ACTION: SF Police Reforms

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 11:04:00 AM

From: Elizabeth Stahl <estahl444@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 9:20 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS)

<dean.preston@sfgov.org>

Subject: ACTION: SF Police Reforms

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a voter in District 5, I highly recommend that Mr. Preston and the entire Board force the Police Department to MOVE and stop inhibiting the 272 reform recommendations issued by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2016!!!!!This is 2020 and the department is still delaying police reforms.

In San Francisco, this is unacceptable for the Supervisors to do little or nothing about this.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Stahl San Francisco, CA

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: SF Preschool Letter

Date:Friday, August 28, 2020 1:59:00 PMAttachments:SF preschool Letter for SFDPH .pdf

From: Tamar Kassoff < tamarkassoff@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 1:27 PM

Subject: SF Preschool Letter

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

August 26th, 2020

Dear Mayor Breed, Dr. Colfax, and members of the SFDPH,

We thank you for the continued work you are doing to support our communities, especially in light of the recent spike in COVID cases in the country and in our state. We are a group of San Francisco County Directors of Early Childhood programs and Preschools, and we are writing to seek clarity around the guidance for our Fall operations. We are receiving confusing and at times contradictory information which has left us with unanswered questions about how many children we may support in each stable cohort and how many cohorts a teacher can work with on any given day.

We respectfully seek understanding as to why our Marin counterparts and other childcare facilities around the state are able to operate with more relaxed mandates. For example, in Marin County, preschools and early childhood sites may have cohorts of up to 15 children, and their educators are able to work with two stable groups each day. In San Francisco, we are limited to 12 children in a stable cohort, and educators may only work with one group each day.

This recent confusion regarding what is a regulation and what is a recommendation regarding staff restrictions has left many families stranded last minute without childcare and has forced teachers to lose work, and therefore, income. These are questions we urgently need answered by the San Francisco Department of Public Health:

- For preschool programs, what is the maximum number of children allowed per cohort this Fall when we commence preschool and/or childcare programming?
- Are teachers able to work with two stable, but separate cohorts each day? This would allow for subbing to take place throughout the year.
- If teachers are able to work with two stable, but separate cohorts, what is the maximum number of children allowed in total?

We are strongly advocating for at least 14 children per cohort based on the Governor's latest guidance, which you can find here. It is important to note that cohort groups of only 12 create a financially unsustainable situation for child care programs, which will cause many more child care programs to permanently close in a city already experiencing a childcare shortage before COVID.

This is a critical moment for the survival of many early childhood programs, and we need your help and support in weathering the COVID-19 crisis and continuing to offer care for our youngest San Francisco children. Data and research continue to demonstrate that the youngest children are those least at risk for contracting and transmitting the virus.

We ask that we are able to operate with the same regulations as K-12 schools who have higher risk and yet whose teachers are able to move between cohorts of children. Recently, many preschools in San Francisco were forced to deny previously accepted families their promised enrollment spaces due to

conflicting messages from SFDPH, unenrolling many families unexpectedly just before school was set to open.

The current mandate also leads to unexpected layoffs and the loss of hours for teachers. Continuing with the current regulations will force centers and schools to close their doors because limiting enrollment, coupled with the increased expenses and staffing required to operate safely, are simply financially untenable.

Other schools are being forced to disenroll families because they do not have enough physical space to dedicate a room for each group of only 12 children. This leads to fewer children receiving care, and more hardships for families in need of the care.

Currently, many of us have been operating our summer camp programs following the clear guidance from your department, while also anticipating that our fall program cohort sizes would be expanded according to our previous operating license limits and staff ratios.

We are requesting your assurance that you will allow early childhood programs (i.e.preschools) to open or reopen at the beginning of the school year with cohort sizes that are greater than the 12 maximum that was mandated for summer programs and camps, to the extent that is reasonable given the ability to do so safely.

While we remain deeply concerned about the rates of COVID-19 in our counties and in our state, we also know this:

- The continued isolation of young children has tremendously deleterious effects on their development;
- Working parents with very young children must have care in order to work;
- Current evidence indicates that young children are the least likely population to transmit COVID-19;
- Current pop-up daycares for the children of essential workers in our areas have been tremendously safe and successful;
- Distance digital learning is highly ineffective/not even possible for very young children;
- In-person learning and socialization is a critical need for young children's healthy development.

We are confident that we are able to provide care for these children while following all health department guidelines, including reasonable size cohorts, masking (when developmentally appropriate), increased outdoor time, improved ventilation in the indoor environments, an increased emphasis on hand hygiene, as well as health daily health screenings.

We are first and foremost concerned with the health and safety of our teachers, staff, children and families whom we serve in our schools and centers. We have appreciated your steadfast leadership in our county since the March Shelter in Place was first issued, and we share your priorities for the health and well being of children and families. We have based our operating decisions since then on your guidance, our

obligations under updated Community Care Licensing regulations, and our own judgment of how best to keep our children and staff safe and aligned with efforts to mitigate the transmission of COVID-19.

We are committed to our partnership with you, and we urgently need your help today so we can plan for a rapidly approaching new school year. We request a meeting before the end of this week, August 28th, 2020.

Thank you for your help, and please let us know when we can expect to meet with you.

Sincerely,

Michelle Lawton
Owner & Director
Stretch the Imagination Preschool
Lower Pac Heights

Kaile Thomas
Executive Director
The Little School
Laurel Heights

Jacque Grillo
Executive Director
Lone Mountain Children's Center
The Presidio

Katherine Barboni Director Beth Sholom Family Preschool Richmond District

Irene Byrne
Executive Director
Phoebe Hearst Preschool
Western Addition

Kelly Dotson Senior Site Director Jewish Community Center of San Francisco, ECE Program Laurel Heights

Michelle Adelsheim Executive Director

Lakeside Presbyterian Center for Children Lakeshore

Kris Taylor Exec. Director The Room To Grow Preschool Bernal Heights/Glen Park Rockridge

Roger Setterfield Director St. James Preschool Richmond District

Gabriella Judd Cirelli Co-Owner and Executive Director Primeros Pasos Bayview / Portola and Glen Park

Darcy Campbell Executive Director Cow hollow School Presidio

Jacquelyn Cool
Co-Director & Owner
The Storybook School
Sunset/Parkside District

Lisa Tejada Owner & Director Golden Gate Guppies Preschool Pacific Heights

Julie Matsuoka
Executive Director
Gates & Bridges Preschool
Inner Sunset District

Leanne Foley Owner/Director Eureka Learning Center Noe Valley Sarah Shimkunas Program Director SF Tikes Academy Mission

Mimmi Skoglund

Director

The Scandinavian School and Cultural Center

Forest Hill

Tori Koneya

Director

Little Urbanites Preschool

Sunset/Parkside

Salima Goltser

Director

Au P'tit Monde French Preschool

Hayes Valley

Julie Fellom

Director

Neighborhood Playgarden

Castro/Noe Valley

Jessie Elliot

Administrative Director

Golden Bridges School - Dandelion Preschool

Excelsion

Jennifer Silver

Executive Director/owner

Tiny Giants Preschool-Lower Nob Hill

Maria Chew

Director

Laurel Hill Nursery School

Ilana Israel & Megan Dusablon

Directors

Spire School

The Presidio

Kim Garcia-Meza Director Las Mananitas Westwood Park

Amanda Riccetti Big City Montessori Hunters Point From: aeboken

To: Jason Elliott; Ann O"Leary; BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS)

Subject: Strongly Urging Governor Newsom VETO AB725 (Wicks)

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 3:27:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted

TO: Jason Elliott

Chief Deputy Cabinet Secretary, Senior Counselor for Housing and Homelessness

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

cc: Ann O'Leary

Chief of Staff to the Governor

FROM: Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN) is strongly urging Governor Newsom to VETO AB725 (Wicks) for the following reasons:

AB725 AUTHOR/CO-AUTHORS

The author is Wicks and the co-authors are Skinner and Wiener. As both Buffy Wicks and Nancy Skinner have neither the expertise nor the track record on housing legislation, the most likely scenario is that the bill was actually written primarily by Scott Wiener from San Francisco.

This is reinforced by the listing of bills related to AB725. Two of the three prior related bills (SB50, SB828 and AB1771) are by Scott Wiener.

AB725 CO-SPONSOR/SOURCE

The co-sponsor/source for AB725 is California YIMBY. California YIMBY was founded and is funded by Big Tech.

This is confirmed by an article posted on the Housing is a Human Right website by Patrick Range McDonald dated January 13, 2020. The article is titled Inside Game: California YIMBY, Scott Wiener and Big Tech's Troubling Housing Push. The article refers to a previous LA Times piece when it quotes Anya Lawler of the Western Center on Law and Poverty. Ms. Lawler states "The YIMBY movement has a white privilege problem. I don't think they recognize it. They don't understand poverty. They don't understand what it's like, who our clients really are and what their lived experience is."

AB725 KEY EVENTS

- Committee report is prepared for the Assembly Housing and Community Development (HCD) Committee by Senior Consultant Steve Wertheim. He has been on staff for 2 years. Prior to that, he was on staff for 12 (twelve) years with the San Francisco Planning Department. He was a Principal Planner with a focus on area plans. His area plans include the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan and the Central SoMa (South of Market) Plan. Besides writing the Assembly HCD Committee report for AB725, he also wrote the AB725 Assembly Third Reading (Floor Vote Analysis) report and the AB725 Assembly Concurrence on Senate Amendments report.
- Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee conducts a hearing on AB725 with David Chiu from San Francisco as its Chair.
- Senate Housing Committee conducts a hearing on AB725 with Scott Wiener from San Francisco as its Chair.

AB725 IS NOT A CONSENSUS BILL

Based on an 80 member Assembly and a 40 member Senate, the vote count is as follows:

Assembly Floor Vote 48/22/10

Senate Floor Vote 23/14/3

Assembly Concurrence Vote 46/22/11 (1 vacancy)

AB725 IS NOT TIME SENSITIVE

AB725 affects the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Cycle #6 which doesn't begin until 2023. Therefore, there is ample time to reintroduce the bill in the upcoming session.

AB725 HAS FISCAL IMPACTS THAT WOULD BURDEN CITIES

AB725 is an unfunded state mandate.

Per the Assembly HCD Committee report, AB725 "Provides that no (State) reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code."

AB725 ANALYSIS USES QUESTIONABLE RESEARCH CITED IN MULTIPLE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Multiple Committee reports cite research from questionable sources. The reports cite

McKinsey Global Institute (MGI) even though its report on 3.5 million new housing units by 2025 has been widely discredited. Multiple Committee reports also cite Terner Center at UC Berkeley. Terner Center is heavily funded by the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative (Facebook).

AB725 BILL LANGUAGE IS SERIOUSLY FLAWED

One of the major issues is AB725's use of "per acre" as its metric. This obscures the fact that it is targeting single family zoning. By forcing municipalities to upzone single family areas, AB725 could potentially cause displacement and gentrification in communities of concern including low income communities, communities of color, working class communities and middle class communities.

Once again, the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods is strongly urging Governor Newsom to VETO AB725 (Wicks).

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Boken

State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

BOS-11

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Tax the vehicles used by companies to deliver on the streets accordingly due to impacts.

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:59:00 AM

----Original Message----

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 8:09 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <box/>board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Tax the vehicles used by companies to deliver on the streets accordingly due to impacts.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

SFBOS

I watch daily as vans cars and personal vehicles from scooters to rent a cars are used by amazon to deliver packages food and other items.

These vehicles are often not electric or environmentally friendly, left idling while the driver makes a delivery and parked haphazardly in streets and traffic transit zones without concern.

They often deliver without recycling processes in place relying on our Sf Dept of the environment sfdpw and Recology to provide clean up of stolen packages and tossed wrappings.

I would suggest an investigation into this and a taxation of the companies or fines for overuse of city infrastructure (streets) so that we recoup some of the toxic waste we are seeing going to bezos amazon 200 billion.

There needs to be an accounting of how many drivers amazon is using on our streets and how this is impacting systems like transportation.

The recent flyers for amazon jobs at 17.25 an hour is neglectful of the toll and impacts amazon is having on our city streets when exhausted drivers working for min wages are racing around delivering.

The idea is to tax accordingly and require labels and signage on ALL delivery vehicles especially more visible signage on lyft and Uber cars which are highly difficult to see in the dark and cause accidents.

Sincerely

A.Goodman D11

Sent from my iPhone

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

 Subject:
 FW: Treasure Island Building Moratorium

 Date:
 Friday, September 4, 2020 10:48:00 AM

 Attachments:
 CSFN Treasure Island Resoltion May.pdf

From: Glenn Rogers <alderlandscape@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 7:00 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS)

<aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Treasure Island Building Moratorium

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Ms Brownell actively encouraged prospective buyers of real estate at Hunter;s Point to buy land there claiming the land was safe. The fact it was not safe makes her actions extremely troubling.

Glenn Rogers
Vice PresidentCSFN



TREASURE ISLAND BUILDING MORATORIUM RESOLUTION

Whereas, in the new report, *Adapting to Rising Tides Bay Area*, the waters in the San Francisco Bay will be 4 feet higher in the year 2060 which will be equal to the amount of fill to be added for new construction; (1)

Whereas, Treasure Island was the site where battleships were cleaned after a nuclear blast at the Bikini Atoll leaving radioactivity on site; (2)

Whereas, the Navy deposited radium-dipped devices in landfills on Treasure Island in the past; (2)

Whereas, in 2006 the Navy published an account of radioactivity on Treasure Island, however, since that publication, new locations of radioactivity have been found in areas where it was not supposed to be; (2) (3)

Whereas, in 2008 contractors found and removed almost 1,300 small radioactive objects on Site 12 beside housing areas; (2)

Whereas, in 2011 state technicians tested Treasure Island's roads with gamma scanners and found 5 areas of "significantly elevated radiation levels" in places accessible to the public; (2)

Whereas, cesium-137 was found close to a building where this substance was stored, when experts reported further tests were needed to be done, the Navy and the City's development authority said there was no need for action and the health department did not comment; (2)

Therefore be it Resolved, that all parties involved in the cleanup of Treasure Island, including the City Attorney, the Navy, the City development authority on Treasure Island, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the SF Health Department, the Treasure Island Homeless Initiative, Lennar and FivePoint Holding LLC construction companies and the John Stewart Co. which manages leases on Treasure Island, halt construction on Treasure Island until these relevant agencies consider it safe and free of radioactivity or any other toxic waste and the fear of rising water has subsided.

Charles Head, CSFN President



FOOT NOTES:

- 1. HTTP://WWW.ADAPTINGTORISINGTIDES.ORG/PROJECT/ART-BAY-AREA/
- 2.. https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Lawsuit-seeks-billion-in-damages-halt-to-14999773.php? utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=headlines&utm_campaign=sfc_morningfix&sid=53ba5f9f9dbcd4ec6e000221https://www.sfchronicle.com/business/article/California-begins-planning-for-transition-away-14996560.php? utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=headlines&utm_campaign=sfc_morningfix&sid=53ba5f9f9dbcd4ec6e000221#
- **3.** https://sfbayview.com/2020/01/treasure-island-residents-bring-2-billion-class-action-lawsuit-for-radiation-and-toxin-exposure/

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>
Subject: FW: Wawona hens

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 11:21:00 AM

From: chaitanya diwadkar <cdiwadkar@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 4:06 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR)

<mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Kessler, Larry (DPH) <larry.kessler@sfdph.org>

Subject: Wawona hens

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mr. Kessler,

It would be a disgrace if the chickens at Wawona were taken away because of the complaint of one vocal person with nothing better to do, especially given the steps that have been taken to meet or exceed the requirements of SFDPH.

San Francisco has already become quite unlivable and expensive thanks to successive administrations bending over to the whims and fancies of the rich who have taken over this city and who apparently only purchase their eggs at Whole Foods so that their good friend Jeff Bezos can become a trillionaire.

It would take particularly vindictive and pedantic health inspectors to deduce that the hens are a health risk to anyone as you can see in the attached image.

I hope the DPH will do the responsible thing and let people who follow the rules live their lives in peace rather than spending precious SF resources on the ravings of the idle rich. With Covid, I'm sure you all are really busy anyway!

Sincerely,

Chait Diwadkar

BOS-11

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: BOS-Supervisors

Subject: FW: what is going on with OUR taxes?

Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 3:49:00 PM

From: john smith <jpatrickbad3371@gmail.com> Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:30 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: what is going on with OUR taxes?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

So I/we will tell everyone you refused to answer OUR questions. Hence, we now(did) know you have NO respect for the very people you work for. you all have a great day I wish you all well

On Wed, Aug 26, 2020 at 9:22 AM john smith < ipatrickbad3371@gmail.com > wrote:

I asked you to reply to my email/letter/note but, you have not. I want a reply to my email. I want to get your response.

On Mon, Aug 17, 2020 at 8:45 AM john smith < ipatrickbad3371@gmail.com > wrote:

What is happening with MY/OUR taxes? I woke up early to mail a letter and the streets and alleys are filled with trash and filth as far as I or anyone can see. I always wake up early but, today I did it to specifically mail ONE letter, and it looked like the apocalypse. So, I want to know what are YOU doing with OUR money? i have lived here for over 30 years! and never have I or anyone encountered such a squandering and mismanagement of tax money. I want YOUR answer(s). I pay you to work for ME. as do ALL of the taxpayers, this farce is over, do you really think you can continue to steal from us? you think when you clean it up and make everything nice for ONE week before the election that will make everything OK? See, this city is emptying out. of course NOT the illegal/criminals(all illegals ARE criminals for simply being here they break federal law. period) and you give THEM MY/OUR tax money while Americans live on the streets and suffer and die, how do you live with yourselves? you have so much sympathy for people from foreign lands but not for OUR fellow citizens. you take photos all smiling and dressed up. in OUR building how dare you all. while Americans, citizens suffer and die you pull this crap. how dare you. you close down everything, and you make our city filthy, you shutter businesses, you ruin lives, people who worked hard and played by your ever changing rules and then you change them and ruin lives.

and before you all say 'we didn't do this, we are just here AFTER it was ruined', no, you all could have fixed it not by making it worse by passing more crap and Orwellian laws to shackel us further. In my opinion you all should be put before a judge and jury and the sentence should be

life and no parole and work off all the money you all have squandered, and the wage should be the pittance you pay prisoners now. and you pass a tax on sugary beverages and you say it is for whom? to benefit kids? really? but, not outlaw cigarettes, oh yeah you wont the tax is too high to outlaw those, you make too much from those, and, dont add a tax to foods that are worse. no, you focus on what lies you can justify. and you wonder why people are FLEEING COMMIE-FORNIA AND SAN- FRAN-SICKO. don't take my word for it ask WSJ and FORBES and every real NON censored news agency. you don't even have the decency to answer MY questions you think i will just go away? of course you hope so. and replace me with whom? illegals you can brainwash? of course they don't even speak the language, WE must speak THEIR language, right? Well I do BUT I REFUSE TO SPEAK THEIR LANGUAGE IN MY COUNTRY. Si? porque, por que, deberia hablar su? Why do you force me to speak the language of invaders who steal jobs, welfare, section 8, EDD money, EBT, and GOD knows what else, while being here is breaking OUR laws?and you are the board of supervisors? you know MAO that guy who murdered millions and CASTRO, AND STALIN, AND HITLER ALL murdered tens of millions and they all had the same story the clowns that worked for them while re-educating them, shooting them, loading in trains and shipped to prisons, 'we are just following orders', OK and whose? following orders from murders is wrong following orders from lawbreakers is wrong. and you will ALL read this and pick it apart and find flaws and imperfections, and seek ways to imprison me.for DARING to convey truth and logic. how dare he! we are the board of supervisors! Have you ever read Orwell? His greatest works are 1984. and Animal Farm. WHY? because he espoused what Americans came here for. his line he wrote from Napoleon, 'All animals are equal', then it became 'All animals are equal BUT some are more equal than others'. sound familiar? while OUR people are homeless YOU dine, you slumber in comfort. And before you dare try and tell me many homeless are boozers and dopers. NO MOST ARE NOT! maybe 20% are boozers and dopers, and WHO brought in and sold them the dope? WHO? the fentanyl and heroin and cooked the meth besides the homeless you paid to cook it in the civic center motel, besides them. who? the ILLEGAL/CRIMINALS. THAT IS WHO. AND THOSE ILLEGAL/CRIMINALS RAPE, MURDER, ASSAULT, ROB, STEAL. and you wonder why this city this state is emptying out. And for those citizens who worked their entire lives and applied for unemployment, you make it impossible? how much longer until people say enough, I'm off to Texas, Florida, Idaho, Utah, South Dakota, North Dakota. Alaska, Arizona and every state still knowing POLITICIANS WORK FOR US NOT ILLEGAL/CRIMINALS NOT FOR THEMSELVES FOR US you break the laws to make illegal/criminals happy. BUT you turn your backs on citizens. I will wait for your response. I will wait and then I will send your response to FOX, CNN, MSNBC, it will be public property like my email to you. so, I will look forward to your response. we pay for this. We pay for these public records and we are NOT happy with the way you have run our city. you have run it into the ground while inviting in illegal/criminals, and remember OUR citizens have kids and needs and THEY pay taxes. NOT the illegal/criminals whatever they pay is PITTANCE compared to WHAT they steal not even mentioning they are here illegally. We have plenty of people who can sweep ,mop, do menial work, and we don't need to import millions of criminals to do it. you think we are stupid? all of us? Many of us went to college, are educated, many more than YOU. So, how are you going to fix this? you took the job, remember you took the job and receive a salary, and what have you done?

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: With fire haze and spare air days why not restrict auto use? Or enforce zero emissions? It's the lacking

transit solutions....

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 9:47:00 AM

----Original Message-----

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com> Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 8:42 AM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <box>

| Soard.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: With fire haze and spare air days why not restrict auto use? Or enforce zero emissions? It's the lacking transit solutions....

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Seems we see again and again why we have no real mass transit solutions or leadership.

The spare air days should require a "no-drive" policy for spare air days except essential emergency vehicles.

And the delivery services which also comprise of many non-energy efficient vehicles should be halted (amazon delivery) when they have multiple unmarked vehicles roaming the streets..

Today even with hazy skies cars are flying everywhere and their should be reason enough to stop the emissions and require mass transit solutions take priority...

Every vehicle adds to the problem....

Ag D11

Sent from my iPhone

BOS-11

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

To: <u>BOS-Supervisors</u>

Subject: FW: Your sheltered tenant claimed disability and abuse the City

Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 9:35:00 AM

From: Eden Niemela <evanier9567@icloud.com>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:33 PM

<mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) cmayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>

Subject: Your sheltered tenant claimed disability and abuse the City


This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

You are going to hear from me as long as your sheltered tenant abused the law!

Friday is a Street Sweeping—everyone including myself, a truly disabled person, move our car for street sweeping but this person who is physically able person lie to the City and who claim disability so he can protest and not be ticketed.

So much more of creating a law "sheltering" people who are crooks, who knows how to abuse the City, the State and knows how to manipulate the law!

Enclosed is a picture of the Ford light blue of a PHYSICALLY ABLE MAN who found a way to get away with the street sweeping law and who you "sheltered" and who had the audacity of throwing firecrackers which is illegal—- why are you protecting crooks, you are an official who I voted and support before!



Sent from my iPhone