FILE NO: 190750

Petitions and Communications received from June 17, 2019, through July 1, 2019, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 9, 2019.

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 appointment: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- **Elizabeth Salveson** - Civil Service Commission - term ending June 30, 2025

From the Office of the Controller, submitting a report entitled, “Helping San Francisco Public Library Understand What Patrons Want.” Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the Controller City Services Auditor, submitting a report entitled, “San Francisco Sheriff's Department: Key Strategies Could Help the Sheriff Reduce Its Heavy Reliance on Overtime and Better Communicate Its Staffing Needs”. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Controller, in conjunction with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, submitting a compliance audit of Oliver De Silva, Inc. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting the Controller’s Office Fee Certifications FY2019-2020 and FY2020-2021. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Controller’s City Services Auditors, submitting a report summarizing the results of four cash-handling audits of seventeen cash collection locations in FY2017-2018 and FY2018-2019. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of Early Care and Education, submitting a Five Year Spending Plan. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, regarding Small Business Permit Streamlining. File No. 181211. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Jon Golinger of Protect Coit Tower, regarding the proposed legislation to increase park fees. File No. 190629. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Kristy Wang of SPUR, regarding the prosed Charter Amendment to provide streamlined review of eligible affordable housing and housing for teachers. File No. 190437. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Navigation Center at the Embarcadero, Seawall Lot 330. File No. 190612. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the San Francisco Forest Alliance, regarding accessibility for deforestation in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From UNITE HERE Local 2 and IFPTE Local 20, regarding California Senate Bill No. 343 (Pan). 2 letters. File No. 190690. (13)

From Marvis J. Phillips, regarding Larkin Street Youth Services Housing Programs. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Jordan Davis, regarding rent relief. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Benjamin Najmark, regarding plastic cup waste in bars and restaurants. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding muni reliability and environmental policies. (17)

From Phyllis Ball, regarding the spraying RoundUp at Glenn Park. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed legislation restricting the sale, manufacture, and distribution of tobacco products, including electronic cigarettes. 10 letters. File No. 190312. (19)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Police patrol budget. 200 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From the Small Business Commission, submitting a resolution titled, "Economic Mitigation Measures Responsive to City Bans on the Sales of Certain Tobacco Products.” Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From:	Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); GIVNER, JON (CAT); Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR)
Subject:	TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Reappointment, Charter 3.100(18)
Date:	Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:38:00 PM
Attachments:	Clerk"s Memo 6.26.19.pdf Mayoral Appointment.pdf

---

Hello,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete reappointment package, pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18). Please see the attached 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) 554-7703 | 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: June 26, 2019

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Reappointment

On June 25, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete reappointment package, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- **Elizabeth Salveson** - Civil Service Commission - term ending June 30, 2025

This reappointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors. 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 are interested in requesting a hearing on this reappointment, please notify me in writing by **12:00 p.m. Friday, July 5, 2019.**

(Attachments)

c: Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
Kanishka Cheng - Mayor's Boards and Commissions Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 JUN 25 PM 4: 33
BY

June 20, 2019

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:

Elizabeth Salveson to the Civil Service Commission for a six year term ending June 30, 2025.

I am confident that Ms. Salveson 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, Kanishka Karunaratne Cheng, at 415.554.6696

Sincerely,

London Breed

London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

From:	Reports, Controller (CON)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Supervisors; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fay, Abigail (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Philhour, Marjan (MYR); Power, Andres (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Valdez, Marie (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Lynch, Andy (MYR); Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR); alubos@sftc.org; pkilkenny@sftc.org; Rose, Harvey (BUD); Goncher, Dan (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Docs, SF (LIB); CON-EVERYONE; MYR-ALL Department Heads; CON-Finance Officers; Sanderson, Denise (LIB); Park, Yoon (LIB); Gong, Regan (LIB); Berger, Quindi (LIB); Fortin, Thomas (LIB); Hall, Mark (LIB); Alcala, Rebecca (LIB); Delneo, Catherine (LIB); McClure, Randle (LIB); Lee, Eun (LIB); Tilney, John (LIB); Jeffers, Michelle (LIB); Cocking, Shellie (LIB); Lambert, Michael (LIB); Liang, Michael (LIB); Lombardi, Roberto (LIB); Regler, Lori (LIB); Singleton, Maureen (LIB)
Subject:	Issued: Helping San Francisco Public Library Understand What Patrons Want
Date:	Thursday, June 13, 2019 10:22:29 AM

In order to make informed decisions about materials, space use, and programming, San Francisco Public Library (SFPL) needs to have a clear understanding of patrons' needs. SFPL requested assistance from City Performance to evaluate current survey and data tools, gather best practices from peer libraries, and work with the Research, Strategy, and Analytics team to create a data development framework to better incorporate patron input, preferences, and behavior into Library decision-making.

The proposed framework lays out next steps for the next three years of data development, including:

- Linking program attendance data to library records
- Segmenting patrons by patterns of behavior and tailoring outreach strategies to particular needs
- Using email surveys and telephone surveys to hear from digital users and non-users

To view the project summary, please visit our website at:
http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2718

This is a send-only email address.

For questions, please contact Isabel Ochoa at isabel.m.ochoa@sfgov.org.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController. To subscribe to our reports, go here.

Helping San Francisco Public Library Understand What Patrons Want

Office of the Controller | City Performance Unit June 2019

What We Did

In order to make informed decisions about materials, space use, programming, and other factors central to the successful operation of the Library, San Francisco Public Library (SFPL) needs to have a clear understanding of patrons' needs. SFPL requested assistance from City Performance to develop options to reliably gauge patron perceptions and experiences such that patron input can inform Library decision-making in meaningful ways. Although the San Francisco City Survey, conducted every two years by the Controller's Office, shows a steady increase in residents' general satisfaction with SFPL, SFPL does not currently have a process to gather data with greater frequency and specificity to inform strategy and operations.

City Performance interviewed SFPL staff at all levels of the Library and facilitated two focus groups—one with Main Library managers and another with branch district managers. These conversations surfaced shortcomings in current evaluation practices and questions library staff want to be able to answer in the future. City Performance spoke with peer library systems to identify industry best practices in evaluating library services, particularly around evaluating the patron experience. City Performance then worked with SFPL's Research, Strategy, and Analytics team (RSA) to develop an improved evaluation framework for implementation over the next three years.

Opportunities for Improvement

- **Current surveys are not capturing key information desired by SFPL stakeholders**, including what brings patrons to the Library, patrons' current interests and goals, and a better understanding of patron demographics.
- **Survey protocols are not rigorous or uniform**, which negatively affects the quality of the data. Library staff tasked with administering surveys are not given training or methodologies to follow, and the data collection process is generally burdensome, which leads staff to deprioritize the survey administration and further degrades the resulting data.
- **The outputs of existing systemwide surveys are not used by the Library in meaningful ways**. Although SFPL administers a systemwide patron survey, these results are not typically incorporated into SFPL's decision-making processes, as the resulting data is not statistically valid and does not fill necessary information gaps. Survey data and findings do not reliably reach public services staff, limiting the scope of the survey's impact.
- **Existing survey instruments are not effective in reaching digital users.** Although the proportion of digital users at SFPL is steadily increasing, these users are not surveyed through existing methods.
- **Non-users are not currently captured through any survey tool** even though feedback from non-users can provide valuable insights into the broader community's perception of SFPL's value.

Contact Information

For more information, please contact:
Isabel M. Ochoa
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
isabel.m.ochoa@sfgov.org

Or visit:
http://www.sfcontroller.org
@sfcontroller

City and County of San Francisco
Office of the Controller
City Performance Unit
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA, 94102

Promising Practices in Peer Library Systems

Peer Library Systems interviewed

Columbus (OH) Metropolitan Library

Sno-Isle (WA) Libraries

DC Public Library

New York Public Library

Seattle Public Library

Richland (SC) Library

- Some peer systems have seen value in **scanning patron library cards at library programs and events** to better track individuals' attendance. This helps libraries systematically understand engagement with specific programs, make programming decisions based on demand, and provide recommendations to patrons based on past attendance.
- Staff engagement with data is highly dependent on comfort with analysis and presentation, and high-performing libraries have **invested in training staff to use basic data analysis tools such as Excel.**
- Peer systems have been intentional about seeking **culture change around data use in their libraries**. In addition to providing training, analytics teams regularly explain the value of the data they collect to front-line staff and train and encourage managers to model data use.
- Most peer library systems have found that **general satisfaction surveys rarely provide actionable data** and have thus moved toward evaluating specific services rather than soliciting general feedback. Peers found that what patrons said on general satisfaction surveys did not always align with their actual behavior. Feedback was too operational and ill-suited for incorporation into broader strategic decisions.
- Some library systems have used **observational studies to better understand how patrons use library space**.
- One system was able to quantify the impact of educational programming through a **data sharing agreement with the local school district** wherein the Library was able to demonstrate that attendance at after-school support programs at the library resulted in improved academic performance, and noted that other library systems have established similar data sharing agreements with local school districts.

Data Development Plan

City Performance worked with RSA to determine key opportunities for development in SFPL's evaluation work over the next three years:

- **Develop market segmentation strategies** to allow for targeted outreach and equitable distribution of resources by factors like neighborhood and use pattern. RSA is already developing branch profiles to understand the geographical reach of each branch and using a business intelligence tool to categorize users by patterns of behavior.
- **Use regular email surveys to target digital users and consider telephone surveys for non-users**. A regular email survey is a low-cost way to reach patrons who may rarely visit a physical location. City Performance provided basic cost comparisons for larger survey efforts, such as an annual or biennial intercept survey or a telephone survey that could reach non-users.
- **Capture patron attendance data at library programs at an individual level** to help SFPL plan programming based on demand, recommend programming to patrons based on individual interests, and report on programming outputs.
- **Optimize an online "comment box" tool for concerns, compliments, and requests** that supplements the existing physical comment card system. Electronic and paper feedback can be stored together in a single database, automatically routed to library staff, and made available for marketing, facilities planning, and other uses.
- **Create internal transparency around survey data.** Patron feedback, survey results, and operational dashboards should be easily accessible throughout the organization to inform management decisions.
- **Build a culture of data use among SFPL staff**, including communicating the value of collected data, building staff's technical skills so they may engage with the data in meaningful ways, and setting examples of data-centered decision-making at leadership levels.

Project Team

City Performance
Ryan Hunter
Isabel M. Ochoa

San Francisco Public Library

San Francisco Public Library
Michael Lambert, City Librarian
Maureen Singleton, Acting Chief Operating Officer
Randle McClure, Chief Analytics Officer

From:	Reports, Controller (CON)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); alubos@sftc.org; pkilkenny@sftc.org; Campbell, Severin (BUD); Newman, Debra (BUD); Rose, Harvey (BUD); Docs, SF (LIB); CON-EVERYONE; Hennessy, Vicki (SHF); Freeman, Matthew (SHF); Johnson, Katherine (SHF); Hollings, Crispin (SHF); Fisher-Paulson, Kevin (SHF); Miyamoto, Paul (SHF); Pecot, Johna (SHF); Fisher, Michele (SHF); Ramirez, John (SHF)
Subject:	Issued: San Francisco Sheriff"s Department: Key Strategies Could Help the Sheriff Reduce Its Heavy Reliance on Overtime and Better Communicate Its Staffing Needs
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:01:09 PM

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a report on its audit of the Sheriff's Department's staffing practices. The audit found that the Sheriff's workload has increased due to mandates and new service requests, while the department's budgeted staff has remained stagnant. However, the Sheriff should improve its staffing practices so it can better determine and communicate its staffing needs to city stakeholders and decision-makers.

To view the report, please visit our website at:

http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2720

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the report, please contact Chief Audit Executive Tonia Lediju at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.

From:	Reports, Controller (CON)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Supervisors; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fay, Abigail (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Power, Andres (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Lynch, Andy (MYR); Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR); Rose, Harvey (BUD); Goncher, Dan (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Docs, SF (LIB); CON-EVERYONE; MYR-ALL Department Heads; CON-Finance Officers; gmetcalf@spur.org; thart@sfchamber.com; jballesteros@sanfrancisco.travel; Lieberman, Loretta (TTX); Torres, Serena (TTX); Guy, Kevin (CPC); Elliott, Nicole (ADM)
Subject:	Issued: Controller"s Office Fee Certifications FY19-20 and FY20-21
Date:	Friday, June 28, 2019 12:33:59 PM

The Controller has issued its annual report on mandated fee reviews and schedules. The report contains fee information for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 as mandated by various San Francisco Municipal Code sections. The code sections listed in the Controller's certification letters and tables summarize legal requirements and authorization to increase fees. Only those fees which can be increased administratively by the Controller or the departments are reviewed by the Controller. Where authorized, fee adjustments reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) as determined by the Controller. Some fees are being adjusted to change the portion of service delivery costs recovered.

The CPI adjustment factor for most fee increases effective July 1, 2019 is 4.5% and 3.25% for fee increases effective July 1, 2020. The July 1, 2019 rate is based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area and the July 1, 2020 rate is based on CPI as projected by the Controller using California Department of Finance and Moody's forecasts. CPI adjustments will be updated during the FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 budget deliberations.

When possible, based on information received from departments, the Controller has certified that fees do not produce revenue which is significantly more than the costs of providing the services for which each fee is assessed.

The report can be found here:

http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2725

If you have any questions, please contact Michelle Allersma at (415) 554-4792.

This is a send-only email address.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController

From: Reports, Controller (CON)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Supervisors; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Fay, Abigail (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Power, Andres (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Lynch, Andy (MYR); Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR); Rose, Harvey (BUD); Goncher, Dan (BUD); Campbell, Severin (BUD); Docs, SF (LIB); CON-EVERYONE; MYR-ALL Department Heads; CON-Finance Officers; gmetcalf@spur.org; thart@sfchamber.com; jballesteros@sanfrancisco.travel; Lieberman, Loretta (TTX); Torres, Serena (TTX); Guy, Kevin (CPC); Elliott, Nicole (ADM)
Subject: Issued: Controller"s Office Fee Certifications FY19-20 and FY20-21
Date: Friday, June 28, 2019 12:33:59 PM

The Controller has issued its annual report on mandated fee reviews and schedules. The report contains fee information for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 as mandated by various San Francisco Municipal Code sections. The code sections listed in the Controller's certification letters and tables summarize legal requirements and authorization to increase fees. Only those fees which can be increased administratively by the Controller or the departments are reviewed by the Controller. Where authorized, fee adjustments reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) as determined by the Controller. Some fees are being adjusted to change the portion of service delivery costs recovered.

The CPI adjustment factor for most fee increases effective July 1, 2019 is 4.5% and 3.25% for fee increases effective July 1, 2020. The July 1, 2019 rate is based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area and the July 1, 2020 rate is based on CPI as projected by the Controller using California Department of Finance and Moody's forecasts. CPI adjustments will be updated during the FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 budget deliberations.

When possible, based on information received from departments, the Controller has certified that fees do not produce revenue which is significantly more than the costs of providing the services for which each fee is assessed.

The report can be found here:

http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2725

If you have any questions, please contact Michelle Allersma at (415) 554-4792.

This is a send-only email address.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController

From:	Reports, Controller (CON)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR); Cretan, Jeff (MYR); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); alubos@sftc.org; pkilkenny@sftc.org; Campbell, Severin (BUD); Newman, Debra (BUD); Rose, Harvey (BUD); Docs, SF (LIB); CON-EVERYONE; MYR-ALL Department Heads; CON-Finance Officers; Reiskin, Ed (MTA); Leo Fermin (AIR); Sakelaris, Kathleen (MTA); Hammons, Diana (MTA); Keileh, Jad (MTA); Kao, Paul (MTA); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Chu, Derek (REC); Sutton, Maria (REC); Donnelly, AnneMarie (REC); Lew, Pat (REC); Campbell, Thomas (FAM); Prohaska, Ed (FAM); Seifer, Jason (FAM); lschram@famsf.org; Colfax, Grant (DPH); Wagner, Greg (DPH); Ehrlich, Susan (DPH); Boffi, Jennifer (DPH); Boyo, Tosan (DPH); Dentoni, Terry (DPH); Woods, David (DPH); Inouye, Valerie (DPH); Ferrer, Rosaly (DPH); Turner, Andrea (DPH); Sansone, Judith (DPH); Istvan, Thomas (DPH); Merriman, Katherine (DPH); Vong, Kammy (DPH); Huang, Cynthia (DPH)
Subject:	Issued: Citywide Cash Transactions Fiscal Year 2017-18 and 2018-19 – Weaknesses Exist in Some Cash-Handling Processes
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 3:42:23 PM

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a report summarizing the results of four cash-handling audits of 17 cash collection locations completed in fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19. The audits found that departments need to improve cash-handling processes in areas including:

- Security around cash
- Tracking of cash
- Controls over receipts
- Collection of cash
- Depositing of cash
- Reconciliation of collections
- Written cash-handling procedures
- Training of cash-handling staff

To view the report, please visit our website at:
http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2724

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the report, please contact Chief Audit Executive Tonia Lediju at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or the CSA Audits Division at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.

From: Castleman, Maya (HSA) on behalf of Mezquita, Ingrid (HSA)
To: Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); Lee, Ivy (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS); Fregosi, Ian (BOS); Boilard, Chelsea (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); Herzstein, Daniel (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Hepner, Lee (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); Quan, Daisy (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Wright, Edward (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Cancino, Juan Carlos (BOS); Remski, Derek (BOS); Simley, Shakirah (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS); Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Mahogany, Honey (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); Temprano, Tom (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Goossen, Carolyn (BOS); Morales, Carolina (BOS); Beinart, Amy (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Gallardo, Tracy (BOS); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS); Ho, Tim (BOS); Chinchilla, Monica (BOS)
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Baby Prop C - First 5 Year Spending Plan
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 1:44:35 PM
Attachments: image003.png
image004.png
OECE_PropC_First5YearSpendingPlanFinal.pdf

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I am excited to submit for your review the First 5 Year Spending Plan for the Early Care and Education for All Initiative (aka Baby Prop C). The First 5 Year Spending Plan (attached) has been a collaborative and multi-stakeholder informed effort that will not only direct implementation planning if/when Prop C funding becomes available, but will also help to inform next steps in OECE's current funding strategies, strategic planning, and alignment with First 5 San Francisco.

Thank you,
Ingrid

Ingrid X. Mezquita
Director

San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education
1650 Mission Street, Suite 312
San Francisco, CA 94103
www.sfoece.org
T: (415) 355-3663 F: (415) 557-5615

Follow us on:

FIVE-YEAR SPENDING PLAN:

Framework for Building San Francisco's Early Care and Education System

San Francisco Office of
Early Care and Education

ABBREVIATION KEY

AMI – Area Median Income
ASR – Applied Survey Research
CAC – OECE Citizens' Advisory Committee
CPAC – San Francisco Child Care Planning and Advisory Council
DCYF – San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
ECE – Early Care and Education
ELS – Early Learning Scholarship
FCCASF – Family Child Care Association of San Francisco
First 5 SF – First 5 San Francisco
FRCs – Family Resource Centers
OECE – San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education
PFA – Preschool for All
Prop C – Proposition C: The Early Care and Education for All Initiative
SFUSD – San Francisco Unified School District
SMI – State Median Income

San Francisco Early Care
and Education for All Initiative

Five-Year Spending Plan: Framework for Building San Francisco's Early Care and Education System

June 2019

San Francisco Office of
Early Care and Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary 1

II. The Need for High Quality, Affordable Early Care and Education in San Francisco 5

Office of Early Care and Education 7

III. Background and Context to the Spending Plan 9

Legal Context 10
Public and Stakeholder Engagement 10
OECE/CPAC Ad-Hoc Committees 18

IV. Spending Plan Program Components and Allocations ... 19

Increasing Access for Low-Income and Moderate-Income Families 19
Investing in Other Services to Support the Well-Being of Children Under Six 21
Increasing Workforce Compensation 23

V. Accountability and Continuous Improvment 25

VI. Implementation 27

VII. Other References and Resources 28

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 5, 2018, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C: Commercial Gross Receipts Tax for Early Care and Education ("Proposition C" or "Prop C"), which may generate an estimated $121 million annually in new local funding dedicated to 1) closing the early education gap for San Francisco's youngest children and their families, and 2) raising wages for the professionals working in this vital sector. Through subsequent local legislation, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors charged the San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education (OECE) with developing a 9-month planning process to engage diverse San Francisco stakeholders in creating the first Five-Year Spending Plan for the Early Care and Education (ECE) for All Initiative ("Spending Plan or Plan").

OECE submitted its community engagement plan to San Francisco's Mayor and Board of Supervisors in November 2018, which included two parallel processes:

1. **Broad and diverse public engagement** to gain insights into all San Franciscans' priorities, needs, and opportunities for ECE in San Francisco.
2. **Collaborative Ad-Hoc Planning Committees with ECE system stakeholders** and advocates to develop specific policy recommendations and spending strategies.

The Five-Year Spending Plan provides a framework that addresses funding needs in four specific early care and education priorities, as outlined in Prop C:

1. **Support for low-income families:** "Support for quality early care and education for children under the age of six in San Francisco families at 85% or less of State Median Income (SMI)."
2. **Support for moderate-income families:** "Support for quality early care and education to all San Francisco children under the age of four whose families earning up to 200% of Area Median Income (AMI)."
3. **Other Services to Support the Well Being of Children Under Six:** "Investment in comprehensive early care and education services that support the physical, emotional, and cognitive development of children under the age of six."

4. **Increasing Workforce Compensation:** "Increasing compensation (including but not limited to wages, benefits, and training) of care professionals and staff in order to improve the quality and availability of early care and education for children under the age of six."

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

OECE conducted two phases of extensive community engagement from November 2018 through June 2019 to develop the Spending Plan. This plan reflects a community outreach process intentionally designed to collect input from parents, families, early educators, ECE stakeholders, and San Francisco community members on their ECE priorities, needs and opportunities.

OECE provided a wide range of inclusive and multi-lingual input activities to increase participation from communities most impacted by Spending Plan priorities. ***Broad outreach efforts*** included

- Newsletters, a dedicated website, social media, targeted communications, and informational materials.
- Two highly interactive ***Community Town Halls*** with over 130 total attendees.
- Twenty-one (21) ***Community Input Sessions***, organized to coincide with existing meetings or special events, which reached more than 2,900 people.
- *The* ***"ECE Bucks" activity***, which captured the priorities of nearly 900 participants through an accessible participatory budgeting approach.
- An ***online survey*** available in Chinese, Spanish and English that enabled over 615 respondents to rank their top ECE priorities.
- Twelve (12) ***Parent and Provider Toolkit Sessions*** that allowed parent groups, educators and ECE professionals to collect direct input from over 200 diverse community members.
- Two ***Ad-Hoc Committees*** created to develop and align strategies to inform the Spending Plan, including 1) the Access and Expansion Committee, and 2) the Workforce Compensation Committee.

SPENDING PLAN PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

These multi-stakeholder engagement processes resulted in the development of targeted funding recommendations for the Prop C priority areas. This Spending Plan supports the vision for an integrated early childhood system. However, a subsequent planning process is needed in order to develop goals, strategies and outcomes aligned with our evaluation framework that addresses school readiness for all children birth-to-five.

At the highest level, OECE recommends the following annual up-to spending allocations:

- **Increasing workforce compensation**: $60 million
- **Increasing access for low and moderate-income families:** $40 million
- **Investing in other services to support the well-being of children under six:** $20 million

OECE will use these allocations to phase-in implementation during various stages of infrastructure and capacity building. OECE's goal is to build a comprehensive system of programs, policies and services that serve the needs of young children and their families and captures family outcomes.

Although Prop C provides significant resources to address ECE system challenges, the funding is not enough to respond to all of the ECE needs facing San Francisco. Informed by stakeholder input, OECE made difficult decisions based on the funding available. The Spending Plan provides an initial framework and mechanism for allocating future funding that may become available.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

In parallel with the development of the Spending Plan, OECE and Applied Survey Research (ASR) developed a process to design a Citywide ECE Evaluation Plan. As part of this process, OECE and ASR conducted a series of multi-stakeholder input sessions in order to identify the greatest ECE needs in San Francisco. Thus far, this collaboration resulted in the identification of four evaluative strategies each linked to the priority areas outlined in the Prop C legislation.

- **Strategy #1:** Increase the number of children from low-income families accessing high quality early care and education programs
- **Strategy #2:** Increase the number of children from moderate-income families accessing high quality early care and education programs
- **Strategy #3:** Raise educator total compensation
- **Strategy #4:** Promote system-wide adoption of and improved access to services that support the physical, emotional, and cognitive development of children

IMPLEMENTATION

Upon the release of Prop C funds, OECE will engage in an implementation planning process including public and stakeholder input. In the interim, OECE will conduct joint planning with First 5 San Francisco (First 5 SF) to align their collective goal of building a comprehensive system of support for all young children and families in the city.

2 THE NEED FOR HIGH QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION IN SAN FRANCISCO

Early childhood is a critical time for developing the skills that prepare San Francisco's children for school and life. Nearly 90% of brain development happens in the first five years of life. Children who experience high quality early care and education are more likely to graduate high school, enroll in college, and work in high-earning jobs as adults.[1] A growing body of evidence demonstrates that high quality, consistent early care and education (ECE) from birth to five maximizes child development, ensures parents can work productively, and that local economies benefit from a more skilled workforce in the long-term.

The societal return on investment in ECE is clear, as evidenced by the following:

- For every $1 invested in high-quality ECE, communities save between $4 and $17 in future costs related to remedial and special education, the juvenile and adult crime systems and welfare support.[2]
- 85% of employers report that providing child care services improves employee recruitment, retention, and productivity.[3]
- Nationally, problems with child care cost parents $8.3 billion in lost wages. Investment in ECE can help working parents recoup these losses.[4]

San Francisco is innovative and leads the country in high quality early care and education. Significant local public investment has improved financial assistance for families, funding for

1 Heckman, J., Grunewald, R. & Reynolds, A. (2006). The Dollars and Cents of Investing Early: Cost-Benefit Analysis in Early Care and Education. *Zero to Three*, 10-17.

2 Shonkoff, J. & Phillips, D. (2000) From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development (Natl. Acad. Press, Washington, DC)

3 Childcare Partnership Project, "Engaging Business Partners," http://www.nccic.acf.hhs.gov/ccpartnerships/facts.fs11.htm, accessed July 9, 2007.

4 Powell, A. Thomason, S. & Jacobs, K. (2019). Investing in Early Care and Education: The Economic Benefits for California. UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education

programs, and training and quality improvement supports for professionals. Despite many strengths and innovations, San Francisco confronts major challenges due to a lack of strong state and national social policy for young children and their families.

- Most San Francisco children are growing up in households where all parents are working full time, making quality child care and preschool a necessity.
- San Francisco has limited licensed infant and toddler care available for children under three years of age, profoundly limiting access.[5]
- With the average annual cost of child care for one child at $23,313, nearly half of San Francisco's families with young children report difficulty affording high quality child care and preschool for their children.[6]
- In 2017, approximately 66% of San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) kindergarteners entered "school ready" (meaning they possessed four key skills: fine motor skills; social emotional learning; numeracy; and early literacy).[7]
  - A substantial opportunity gap exists: Compared to 80% of white children who were kindergarten-ready, only 68% of Asian children and 52% of both African American and Hispanic/Latino children were kindergarten-ready.[8]
- San Francisco has a waitlist of over 3,000 low-income children who are eligible for subsidies but continue to wait due to limited funding allocated by the state and federal governments.
- With the high cost of living in San Francisco and the complexity and demands of working with young children, recruiting and retaining early care and education professionals is increasingly difficult. The average teacher earns $19.37 per hour, or approximately $40,000 per year.[9]

5 Center for American Progress and 2017 CA Child Care Portfolio

6 Children's Council of San Francisco. (2019). Retrieved from https://www.childrenscouncil.org/families/understanding-child-care/child-care-costs/

7 Fall 2017 San Francisco United School District Kindergarten Readiness Inventory Report

8 Ibid.

9 Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley

According to the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment at UC Berkeley:

- 48% of early educators rely on one or more government assistance programs.
- In San Francisco, 92% of the ECE workforce are women; 83% are women of color.
- 75% of early care educators worry about paying monthly bills.
- 54% worry about putting food on the table.[10]

OFFICE OF EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION

High quality early care and education programs that include skilled, educated, and culturally and linguistically diverse providers, help to maximize children's potential. Given this importance to the city's vitality, Mayor Edwin Lee created the San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education (OECE) in 2013. OECE is one of the first and few local city offices dedicated to expanding the availability, affordability and quality of early care and education services for children birth to five in the country. OECE and our city's vision is that every child from birth to five years old in San Francisco has access to high quality and affordable early care and education.

OECE's mission is to leverage state and federal resources for early care and education, steward local funding, and support the early care and education workforce. We believe all San Francisco's children should have a strong early learning and care foundation, supporting the whole child to achieve lifelong success, as illustrated in Figure 1.

In close collaboration with First 5 San Francisco, OECE engages our community partners to ensure our early education and care rises above the national standards for children's school readiness. Through a shared vision that services are whole-child, family-centered, and driven by community, we work towards building a high quality early care and education system that is excellent for our children birth to five and their families. Learn more at sfoece.org.

10 Ibid.

FIGURE 1: OECE AND FIRST 5 SAN FRANCISCO'S APPROACH TO SUPPORTING THE WHOLE CHILD



3 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT FOR THE SPENDING PLAN

On June 5, 2018, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C: Commercial Gross Receipts Tax for Early Care and Education ("Proposition C" or "Prop C"). The proposition imposes a new commercial gross receipts tax, and dedicates 85% of the proceeds generated (currently estimated at $121 million annually) to four early care and education priorities:

1. **Support for low-income families:** "Support for quality early care and education for children under the age of six in San Francisco families at 85% or less of State Median Income (SMI)."
2. **Support for moderate-income families:** "Support for quality early care and education to all San Francisco children under the age of four whose families earning up to 200% of Area Median Income (AMI)."
3. **Other Services to Support the Well Being of Children Under Six:** "Investment in comprehensive early care and education services that support the physical, emotional, and cognitive development of children under the age of six."
4. **Increasing Workforce Compensation:** "Increasing compensation (including but not limited to wages, benefits, and training) of care professionals and staff in order to improve the quality and availability of early care and education for children under the age of six."

Through subsequent local legislation, OECE was charged with developing a 9-month planning process to engage diverse San Francisco stakeholders in creating the first Five-Year Spending Plan for the Early Care and Education for All Initiative (the "Plan"). On November 14, 2018, OECE submitted its community engagement plan, which included two parallel processes:

1. **Broad and diverse public engagement** to gain insights into all San Franciscans' priorities, needs, and opportunities for ECE in San Francisco.

2. **Collaborative Ad-Hoc Planning Committees** with ECE systems stakeholders and advocates to develop specific policy recommendations and spending strategies.

LEGAL CONTEXT

Given a pending legal challenge against Prop C and the potential that an adverse result could lead to refunds of taxes paid, the San Francisco Controller's Office has indicated that any funds collected cannot be spent until the lawsuit is settled. Ideas and strategies generated from the planning process will help identify how San Francisco's early care and education system can improve to better meet the needs of children, families and professionals, with whatever resources are available.

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

OECE conducted two phases of broad community engagement to develop the Spending Plan. The first phase of engagement took place from November 2018 through March 2019, and involved diverse stakeholders in sharing their experiences of current ECE conditions and their priorities for spending the Prop C funds. During the second phase of community engagement from April through June 2019, OECE shared the key findings from the first phase of engagement and collected community input on the draft Plan. Figure 2 illustrates how the different sources of input, research and discussion flow into the creation of the draft and final Spending Plan.

Outreach efforts focused on providing accessible and equitable engagement opportunities for communities most impacted by Spending Plan priorities. These communities include, but are not limited to, parents, caregivers and ECE professionals who do not traditionally participate in planning processes, due to time, resources or other constraints. To increase inclusivity, OECE provided all materials and activities in English, Spanish, and Chinese.

FIGURE 2: TIMELINE FOR PROP C COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT



Key Audiences

San Francisco's ECE community is diverse, given the wide range of families, stakeholders, and system partners. OECE sought to involve all stakeholders in weighing options and data to develop a context-sensitive Spending Plan which fully aligns with San Francisco's conditions and available resources.

Key audiences selected to ensure broad community engagement include the following:

- **General public**
  - San Francisco parents, families and caregivers
  - Early Learning Scholarship (ELS) / Preschool for All (PFA) families
- **ECE Stakeholders**
  - Employees working in early care and education
  - Owners of businesses and non-profits offering early care and education
  - Administrators and support staff of ECE programs
  - OECE Citizen's Advisory Committee
  - San Francisco Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC)
  - Ad-Hoc Access/Expansion Committee
  - Ad-Hoc Workforce Compensation Committee
  - City College of San Francisco
  - Family Child Care Association of San Francisco
  - First 5 San Francisco
  - Parent Advisory Committee of the San Francisco Board of Education
  - Early Care Educators of San Francisco
  - Professionals working in current ELS / PFA programs
  - Other stakeholders
- **Elected Officials**
  - Mayor's Office
  - Board of Supervisors

ECE provided a wide range of engagement activities to collect input from families, caregivers and ECE professionals, shown in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Broad and Inclusive Community Engagement for Prop C
November 2018 - June 2019

Broad Outreach

- Newsletters
- Web Page
- Social Media
- Targeted Communications
- Informational Materials

ECE Bucks Activity

Participatory budgeting exercise to learn about community priorities. Community engagement participants given $120 "ECE Bucks" to distribute between four Prop C priorities plus "other" category for additional priorities.

Community Town Halls

- Interactive and accessible
- Facilitated in English, Spanish and Chinese
- Included ECE Bucks exercise and small group discussions on community needs and priorities for ECE

Community Input Sessions

33 sessions with varied audiences (see Table 1)

Parent and Provider Toolkits

Designed to be used by parent groups, educators and ECE professionals to collect input directly from as many community members as possible. Included all activities and discussion questions from Town Hall #1

Online Survey

- Ranking four key priorities
- Available in English, Chinese and Spanish
- 618 responses received

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the community input sessions and parent and provider toolkit sessions held during Phase One of the community engagement process.

TABLE 1: ECE FOR ALL COMMUNITY INPUT SESSIONS

ECE For All Community Input Sessions			
Input Sessions	**Dates**	**Approximate # of Participants**	**Participant Description**
Mimi and Peter Haas Fund Model Center Meeting	10/25/18	18	Center directors and educators, ECE systems partners
City of San Francisco Preschool Fair	11/7/18	800	Mainly parents of 3-4 year olds; also educators and systems partners
Community Town Hall #1	12/8/18	50+	Parents and ECE educators, including a strong representation from the Chinese ECE community
San Francisco Child Care and Planning Council (CPAC) Meeting	**12/12/18**	23	CPAC members
Parent Voices	1/18/19	11	Low-income parents
Family Child Care Association of SF Board	1/18/19	11	Family Child Care Center Directors and staff
DCYF Citywide Summer Resource Fair	2/9/19	1,100	Parents and families of children 0-5
DCYF Summer Resource Fairs in 11 Supervisorial Districts	February – March 2019	~600	Parents and families of children 0-5
Family Resource Center Focus Group	2/25/19	15	Family Resource Center directors and staff
EDvance Leadership and Equity Event	3/2/19	350+	ECE students, community members, practitioners, policy makers, and administrators
Community Town Hall #2	6/8/19	80+	Parents and ECE educators, including a strong representation from the Chinese ECE and Family Child Care communities
TOTAL		**2,900+**	

TABLE 2: ECE FOR ALL PARENT AND PROVIDER TOOLKIT SESSIONS

ECE For All Parent and Provider Toolkit Sessions			
Input Sessions	**Dates**	**Approximate # of Participants**	**Participant Description**
Compass Family Services: Children's Center Parent Group	2/21/19	6	Primarily monolingual, low-income Spanish-speaking immigrant Latina mothers of infants and toddlers
Compass Family Services: Children's Center Staff	3/1/19	10	ECE teachers of low-income students from throughout SF, primarily Latina and Asian/ Pacific Islander women educators between their 20s-50s
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center	3/6/19	12	Spanish-speaking Latino parents of preschool program students
True Sunshine Preschool	**3/19/19**	9	ECE teachers of low-income students in Chinatown and support staff
Felton Institute	3/21/19	7	Spanish-speaking Latino parents of Felton Institute's Family Developmental Center
Mission Neighborhood Centers	3/21/19	5	Spanish-speaking Latino parents of children 0-5
Faces SF (6 sessions)	February - March 2019	160	Child Care Center and Family Child Care Network teachers, staff, parent groups, board members and volunteers
TOTAL		**200**	

OECE developed "ECE Bucks"—a participatory budgeting exercise—to learn more about community priorities for ECE and to help inform how the City should spend the estimated $121 million annually from Prop C funds. OECE provided participants with $120 in "ECE Bucks" which they could distribute between the four key priorities identified in the Prop C legislation and an "Other" category for any additional priorities. Approximately 890 people participated and shared their ECE priorities during 33 feedback sessions. Figure 4 below shows how participants ranked the four key priorities.

FIGURE 4: ECE BUCKS DASHBOARD



In the online survey, OECE asked participants to 1) identify ECE needs and opportunities in San Francisco, and 2) rank the four key priorities identified in the Prop C legislation. Figure 5 below shows survey respondents' top ranked priorities.

FIGURE 5: TOP RANKED PRIORITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Top Ranked Priority of Survey Respondents

ECE Workforce Compensation	Subsides for Low-Income Families	Increase Other Services for Children 0-5	Financial Assistance to Middle-Income Families
37% of respondents	36% of respondents	14% of respondents	13% of respondents

OECE / CPAC AD-HOC COMMITTEES

As part of the Prop C planning process, the Office of Early Care and Education and the Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC) created two ad hoc committees to develop strategies and priorities to inform a first five-year spending plan. The Ad-Hoc Committee charges included:

- **Ad-Hoc Access and Expansion Committee charge:** To recommend a method of allocation for Prop C funds that would expand access, especially to infants and toddlers, include moderate-income families in mixed income environments and increase capacity in Early Learning Scholarship-qualified programs by June 2019.
- **Workforce Compensation Committee charge:** To recommend a method of allocation for Prop C funds that would increase ECE educator compensation and improve work environments by June 2019.

Each group met monthly from October 2018 through April 2019. On April 24, 2019 ad-hoc committee chairs and OECE staff discussed and aligned the overarching recommendations of each committee.

For more information on the work of the Ad-Hoc Committees, and how their recommendations informed the spending allocations described below, please visit: http://sfoece.org/prop-c-planning/.

4 SPENDING PLAN PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND ALLOCATIONS

Public and stakeholder engagement processes and the resulting recommendations focused intentionally on the priority areas outlined in Prop C legislation. At the highest level, OECE recommends the following annual spending allocations for each priority area:

- Increasing workforce compensation: $60 million
- Increasing access for low-income and moderate-income families: $40 million
- Investing in other services to support children's well-being: $20 million

INCREASING ACCESS FOR LOW-INCOME AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES

The Prop C legislation defines low-income families in San Francisco as those earning 85% of the State Median Income (SMI) or less (for a family of four in 2019, this translates to an annual family income of $76,596 or less[1]). These families are eligible for subsidized early care and education through the California Department of Education's General Child Care and State Preschool funding programs (also known as Title V). However, due to limited funding availability, families that are income-eligible for support may never have access to early care and education for their children. In San Francisco, we place income-eligible families on a waitlist known as "Early Learning San Francisco" (ELSF). On average, there are 3,000-4,000 children under the age of six on the ELSF waitlist at any given time. To ensure low-income families have access to high-quality early care and education, OECE's recommendation is to use Prop C funding to clear the waitlist of eligible families and match children to appropriate spaces in available centers and Family Child Care homes.

1 San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. (2019). 2019 Maximum Income by Household Size Derived from the Unadjusted Area Median Income (AMI) for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area (HMFA) that Contains San Francisco. Retrieved from: https://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOH/Asset%20Management/2019%20AMI_IncomeLimits-HMFA.pdl

The Prop C legislation defines moderate-income families in San Francisco as those with incomes above 85% of the SMI and at or below 200% of the AMI (for a family of four in 2019, this translates to an annual family income between $76,597 - $236,800[2]). These families, not currently eligible for State subsidies, struggle to pay the full market rate for early care and education in the high-cost county of San Francisco.

Discussions during the Ad-Hoc Access and Expansion Committee meetings highlighted the differences in moderate-income families' needs based on the wide income range identified in the Pop C legislation. Through participatory budgeting activities, community members emphasized the importance of equitable supports for moderate-income families. Therefore, OECE proposes progressive financial assistance across the moderate-income eligibility range, maintaining the spirit of the legislation while focusing on families at the lower end of the moderate-income spectrum. OECE plans to structure moderate-income supports so that no child's learning experience will be interrupted due to income eligibility. Our goal is to provide continuity of early learning for children from 0-5 years old regardless of family income fluctuations.

Based on current subsidy reimbursement rates and eligibility requirements, OECE estimates a cost of $30 million annually to clear the low-income waitlist. However, this estimate could change significantly while we wait for the pending litigation to resolve. Rapidly changing demographics in the City, as well as potential changes to reimbursement rates and eligibility requirements, mean that OECE must adopt a flexible approach to funding for low- and moderate-income supports. Therefore, OECE recommends allocating $40 million of Prop C funding to financial assistance for both low- and moderate-income families in order for the City to use any savings leveraged from State investment in supports for low-income families to increase local investment in supports for moderate-income families.

OECE recognizes that Prop C funding alone will not be sufficient to provide financial assistance to every moderate-income family in San Francisco. To serve the growing number of moderate-income families needing financial support to afford early care and education in San

2 Ibid.

Francisco OECE must explore viable, innovative approaches to financing, including identification of additional funding. However, when more resources become available, and/or as San Francisco leverages potential increases in state or federal funding, Prop C funding will ensure that we already have a mechanism in place to build upon and provide support to additional moderate-income families.

INVESTING IN OTHER SERVICES TO SUPPORT THE WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX

Throughout the Prop C public engagement process, parents, educators, and family support staff, expressed the importance of funding programs that go beyond early care and education tuition assistance to support the well-being and healthy development of the whole child. Based on a qualitative analysis of this input, OECE recommends allocating $20 million of Prop C funding to the following "other services" that support the well-being of children under six:

- **Facilities and Capacity Building:** San Francisco lacks the facilities space to serve all of its children in licensed early care and education settings. Additionally, many existing programs are currently operating in facilities built before the era where science established the benefits of early care and education. OECE recommends using Prop C funding to invest in facilities that not only expand capacity, but also acknowledge the differences in space attributes and design for children and adults and how this space design affects usage by children in different age groups by establishing optimal design benchmarked for best practice.
- **Supporting Children with Special Needs:** Across San Francisco, approximately 14% of children entering kindergarten have some form of special need, including speech and language delays, learning disabilities, and emotional behavioral disorders. Despite the critical and urgent need for targeted investment and the availability of tools for conducting universal developmental screening, less than half of children are actually identified who could benefit from early intervention services before reaching kindergarten. Prop C funding should be used to develop a system that identifies the

strengths and abilities of all children ensuring that learning opportunities are maximized and all children are fully included in every educational experience and activity.

- **Supporting Early Childhood Mental Health:** Through the community engagement process, early educators consistently expressed the need to have additional supports for children's social and emotional development. In order to support the expansion of early education access and enrollments appropriately, early childhood mental health and inclusion supports must also expand. OECE recommends using Prop C funding to build on current early childhood mental health services and supports and to champion new programs in order to develop a comprehensive approach that spans a continuum—from promotion to prevention to intervention.
- **Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM):** Creative arts, science, technology, and math experiences are an important part of early childhood. These experiences promote learning and development across all domains of early learning. They foster curiosity and fine motor skills, develop vocabulary about colors and shapes, promote counting and object relations, and build self-regulation skills. These experiences become part of joyful activities for young children that foster discovery and exploration, active and engaged learning, and individual expression. OECE recommends using Prop C funding to expand access to STEAM-focused resources, programs, and curriculum, encouraging broad early education experiences that will positively impact children's relationships with learning throughout their lives.
- **Creating A Systematic Approach to Supporting Families:** During the Prop C community engagement process, family-serving organizations repeatedly stated that the best way to support children's success is to support parents, who after all, are their children's first brain builder, nurse, teacher, tech navigator, advocate, and coach. OECE recommends using Prop C funding to build on a system that supports parents in culturally responsive, linguistically appropriate, strengths-based, and trauma-informed ways. Recognizing the essential role parents

and families play in their children's educational outcomes, our policies, programs and services must be able to:

- Increase long-term impact on families by undertaking a two-generation approach.
- Foster connections between the early learning community, pediatric community and schools, including connections to homeless family navigation services, Family Resource Centers (FRCs), and other family support services.
- Improve data collection capabilities alongside training for all service providers on family engagement, support, and service coordination.

INCREASING WORKFORCE COMPENSATION

Research clearly demonstrates that children benefit significantly from stable and long-term relationships with teachers. Unfortunately, inadequate compensation in the early care and education field has created a workforce crisis. Early education programs across San Francisco are experiencing educator turnover rates at an average of 75% over the last two years.[3] The teacher shortage has exacerbated enrollment capacity issues (as programs must maintain appropriate teacher-child classroom ratios) as well as challenges sustaining program quality. The under-valuation of this critical workforce creates disincentives for current and future educators interested in teaching in early education and many undergraduate students pursue other careers due to low earning prospects in teaching. OECE must address this workforce crisis in order to achieve the other priorities laid out in the Prop C legislation.

With all of this in mind, public engagement, Ad-Hoc Committee work, and OECE Citizen's Advisory Committee input, yielded a clear mandate that increasing workforce compensation should be the top priority for Prop C funds. Therefore, OECE recommends allocating $60 million of Prop C funds to workforce compensation annually with the goal of reaching "parity" with SFUSD salaries in the first five years.

The Ad-Hoc Workforce Compensation committee developed a frame for early educator parity in San Francisco that built on the work of the Center for the

3 CA-QRIS Data Review, 2019.

Study of Child Care Employment at UC Berkeley (CSCCE). The CSCCE defines compensation parity as "parity for salary and benefits for equivalent levels of education and experience, adjusted to reflect differences in hours of work, and including payment for non-child contact hours (such as paid time for planning)." Components included in the parity frame are pay, benefits, and hours of work including time for professional responsibilities (writing reports & planning, etc.).

OECE's workforce compensation strategies seek to increase wages and to:

- Increase benefits including medical, dental, retirement, wellness, housing, child care, commuter benefits, and paid leave time – including sick leave;
- Increase staffing to support professional development, prep, planning, and quality assessment;
- Consider other creative options to support out-of-school and paid leave time, such as high-quality shared substitute pools; and
- Assess work environments using SEQUAL (Supportive Environmental Quality Underlying Adult Learning, SEQUAL studies)

The Prop C funding and framework represents a first step towards building a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional system that addresses early educator recruitment, retention, and working conditions enabling both early educators and children to thrive.



5 ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Beginning in the fall of 2018, Applied Survey Research (ASR) was contracted by OECE to develop a process to design a Citywide ECE Evaluation Plan.

To inform the evaluation planning process, a series of input sessions took place between October 2018 and May 2019 with the stakeholders listed in the table below. At these input sessions, participants were asked to identify the greatest ECE needs at the systems level, at the program level, at the family level, and at the child level. Responses were collected and synthesized into themes.

Using stakeholder input and the "Whole-Child" conceptual model on page 8 (Figure 1) to guide their work, ASR then worked with OECE and First 5 San Francisco (First 5 SF) staff to identify the following possible indicators that relate to strategies identified in the Prop C legislation:

Strategy #1: Increase the number of children from low-income families accessing high quality early care and education programs.

Table 3: Evaluation Planning Input Sessions

Stakeholder	Meeting Date
OECE	10/11/18
FCC Association	11/9/19
First 5 San Francisco	11/14/18
OECE Citizen's Advisory Committee	11/29/18
San Francisco Unified School District	12/4/18
ECE Educators of San Francisco	2/25/19
Integrated Services Agencies Executives	2/28/19
San Francisco Co-op	3/11/19
Child Care Planning & Advisory Council (CPAC)	3/13/19
Head Start / Early Head Start	3/18/19
Parent Voices	5/3/19
Title 5 Contractors	5/9/19

Possible indicators: Increased ECE access for 0-5 year olds from low-income households; underserved populations access services.

Strategy #2: Increase the number of children from moderate-income families accessing high quality early care and education programs.

Possible indicators: Increased ECE access for children from moderate-income households.

Strategy #3: Raise educator total compensation.

Possible indicators: Increased total compensation for educators; increased teacher retention.

Strategy #4: Promote system-wide adoption of & improved access to services that support the physical, emotional, & cognitive development of children.

Possible indicators: Increased access to mental health consultations & resources; 100% children in city-funded ECE receive developmental screenings; increased number of children with dental, vision, hearing, or nutrition needs receive services.

As an immediate next step, OECE and First 5 SF are working with ASR to create the Citywide ECE Evaluation Plan, which will include a logic model and indicators that will be used to monitor the City's progress toward its outcomes. While some data indicators may be currently available to help the city gauge its progress toward specific outcomes, others may need to be collected or developed to monitor progress. The Evaluation Plan will also identify ways for OECE and First 5 SF to address some of the themes identified in the stakeholder input process about acute challenges facing the field now including many that the proposed uses for Prop C funding will help to address.

The Evaluation Plan will be vetted with stakeholders and refined on an ongoing basis with stakeholder input to ensure the logic model, indicators, and overall Evaluation Plan reflect current needs, trends, and realities in our ECE system.

On an ongoing basis, OECE and First 5 SF will publish a public annual report outlining progress made toward the outcomes in the logic model. The annual reports will include updated data so readers can easily track progress over the years, and contextual information to help interpret trends.

6 IMPLEMENTATION

Due to the pending legal challenge against Prop C, it is difficult to estimate a precise timeline for the implementation of this Spending Plan. When, or if, Prop C funding is available, OECE will engage in a comprehensive implementation planning process focusing on each of the four legislative priority areas, directly involving the public, families, educators and ECE stakeholders. However, beyond the identified legislative priorities for early care and education to be addressed through Prop C funding, OECE recognizes that there are current early care and education system components that require immediate attention. These include reviewing ELS reimbursement rates, identifying the expansion of the ELS network of centers and Family Child Care educators, and focusing on the initial challenges created by the introduction of the new waitlist, Early Learning San Francisco (ELSF). Even without additional resources, work will continue on building and refining the current system, taking into account all of the feedback and input OECE has gathered during the past nine months.

We are in the process of writing the next chapter in the history of OECE. In close partnership and through joint planning with First 5 San Francisco, we will be working in the upcoming months to identify a shared vision for San Francisco's quality early education and supports for its youngest children and their families within an equity framework.



7 OTHER REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

The following resources provide additional background on San Francisco's efforts to provide high-quality and affordable early care and education across the city:

- **San Francisco Citywide Plan for Early Care and Education.** Adopted by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors of San Francisco in April 2016; outlines key goals and principles that guide our work in enhancing the City's ECE landscape.
- **Proposed Approach and Design for Developing the Five-Year Spending Plan.** Adopted by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors in November 2018; details the background and process for developing this initial Five-Year Spending Plan.
- **Proposition C: Early Care and Education for All.** Ordinance establishing the Early Care and Education for All Initiative and identifying four key priorities.
- **Phase One Community Engagement Summary.** A detailed summary of the process undertaken by OECE to involve diverse stakeholders in sharing their experiences of current ECE conditions and priorities for Prop C funds; and the high-level input shared by San Francisco's parents, providers and other ECE community members.

San Francisco Office of Early Care and Education

1650 Mission Street, Suite 312
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415.355.3670
sfoece.org

BOS-11
File No: 181211
2 letters

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: FW: SF Chamber Letter re: Support for File No. 181211
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 5:48:00 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
6.13.19_Support for Small Business Streamlining.pdf

From: Mary Young <myoung@sfchamber.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2019 3:36 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Torres, Joaquin (ECN) <joaquin.torres@sfgov.org>; Arvanitidis, Laurel (ECN) <laurel.arvanitidis@sfgov.org>; VanHouten, Ben (ECN) <ben.vanhouten@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Chamber Letter re: Support for File No. 181211

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Peskin,

Please see attached letter from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce expressing our support for File No. 181211.

Thank you,

Mary Young
Manager, Public Policy
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
(O) 415-352-8803 • (E) myoung@sfchamber.com

235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
tel: 415.352.4520 • fax: 415.392.0485
sfchamber.com • twitter: @sf_chamber

June 13, 2019

The Honorable Aaron Peskin
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: SUPPORT: File #181211 Small Business Permit Streamlining

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, representing thousands of local businesses, supports legislation introduced by Mayor London Breed and Supervisor Vallie Brown that will streamline permitting for certain small businesses and allow for more flexible uses of some commercial spaces in San Francisco's neighborhood merchant corridors (File #181211, Small Business Permit Streamlining). This item is scheduled to come before the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors on June 17, 2019.

The Retail Study carried out by OEWD in 2018 found that San Francisco's retail landscape, like that across the country, is changing in multiple ways that make it more challenging for local businesses, especially restaurants and small retailers, to open in San Francisco and be sustainable over time. Compounded by our city's complex and costly regulatory and permitting processes, we are experiencing high commercial vacancy rates and an increase in empty storefronts that make it difficult for our neighborhood commercial districts to thrive.

We believe small business permit streamlining is one of the ways we can mitigate these challenges and help local merchants establish themselves successfully. This legislation will create reasonable controls to ensure new businesses will be compatible with their neighborhoods without inflicting undue, bureaucratic burdens that delay and sometimes prevent them from opening.

Among other things it aligns alcohol license types with state laws, removing the need to seek a Letter of Determination from the Zoning Administrator that adds time and uncertainty to the permitting process. It also replaces the ¼ mile buffer around NC Districts with a less restrictive 300-foot buffer that enables businesses to go into neighborhoods where they are beneficial and welcome while ensuring non-compatible uses are not allowed adjacent to districts with their own specific controls.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce supports policies that assist and encourage businesses to enter our market and thrive over time. We believe this legislation is an excellent example of how we can work collaboratively and creatively to craft policies that are supportive of the business community, especially our small businesses, that will help them gain a foothold in San Francisco's neighborhood commercial districts and be successful in the long-term. We urge you to support this legislation when it comes before you at the Land Use and Transportation Committee on May 6th and at the full Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

Rodney Fong
President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

cc: Clerk of the Board, to be distributed to all Supervisors; Mayor London Breed; Joaquin Torres, Laurel Arvanitidis and Ben Van Houten, OEWD

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SF Chamber of Commerce Letter: Support File #181211 Small Business Permit Streamlining
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 1:00:00 PM
Attachments:	June242019_SmallBizStreamliningSupport.pdf

From: Jay Cheng <jcheng@sfchamber.com>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 10:37 AM
Subject: SF Chamber of Commerce Letter: Support File #181211 Small Business Permit Streamlining

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors;

Please see attached letter from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce expressing our support for File #181211 Small Business Permit Streamlining as the legislation was originally proposed and unanimously supported by the Planning Commission.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Jay Cheng

Public Policy
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
tel: 415.352.4520 • fax: 415.392.0485
sfchamber.com • twitter: @sf_chamber

June 24, 2019

The Honorable Aaron Peskin
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, #244
San Francisco, CA 94012

RE: Support for File #181211 Small Business Permit Streamlining

Dear Supervisor Peskin:

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, representing thousands of local businesses, supports legislation introduced by Mayor London Breed and Supervisor Vallie Brown that will streamline permitting for certain small businesses and allow for more flexible uses of some commercial spaces in San Francisco's neighborhood merchant corridors (File #181211, Small Business Permit Streamlining). This item is scheduled to come before the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors on June 24, 2019.

The Retail Study carried out by OEWD in 2018 found that San Francisco's retail landscape, like that across the country, is changing in multiple ways that make it more challenging for local businesses, especially restaurants and small retailers, to open in San Francisco and be sustainable over time. Compounded by our city's complex and costly regulatory and permitting processes, we are experiencing high commercial vacancy rates and an increase in empty storefronts that make it difficult for our neighborhood commercial districts to thrive.

As the Chronicle reported in their story on June 13, 2019, *San Francisco's North Beach is Littered with Empty Storefronts,* the city's permitting process punishes small business owners looking to fill empty storefronts. The legislation as proposed will help neighborhoods like Castro, Cole Valley, and Noe Valley fill their empty storefronts by reducing unnecessary zoning buffers that overlap with less restrictive merchant corridors.

We believe small business permit streamlining is one of the ways we can mitigate these challenges and help local merchants establish themselves successfully. This legislation will create reasonable controls to ensure new businesses will be compatible with their neighborhoods without inflicting undue, bureaucratic burdens that delay and sometimes prevent them from opening.

Among other things, it aligns alcohol license types with state laws, removing the need to seek a Letter of Determination from the Zoning Administrator that adds time and uncertainty to the permitting process. It also replaces the ¼ mile buffer around NC Districts with a less restrictive 300-foot buffer that enables businesses to go into neighborhoods where they are beneficial and welcome while ensuring non-compatible uses are not allowed adjacent to districts with their own specific controls.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce supports policies that assist and encourage businesses to enter our market and thrive over time. We believe this legislation is an excellent example of how we can work collaboratively and creatively to craft policies that are supportive of the business community, especially our

235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
tel: 415.352.4520 • fax: 415.392.0485
sfchamber.com • twitter: @sf_chamber

small businesses, that will help them gain a foothold in San Francisco's neighborhood commercial districts and be successful in the long-term. The legislation as originally proposed and unanimously supported by the Planning Commission deserves your support, and we hope you will move it forward when it comes before you at the Land Use and Transportation Committee and the full Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

Rodney Fong
President & CEO
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

cc: Clerk of the Board, to be distributed to all Supervisors; Mayor London Breed; Joaquin Torres, Laurel Arvanitidis and Ben Van Houten, OEWD

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS)
Subject:	FW: FILE NO: 190629: Proposed 50% Park Fees Increase and Removal of Board of Supervisors Authority to Set Visitor Entrance Fees to Botanical Gardens, Japanese Tea Garden, Conservatory of Flowers, and Coit Tower Elevator – OPPOSE
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 5:47:00 PM
Attachments:	OpposeLetter_Proposed50%ParkFeePriceHike.pdf

From: Protect Coit Tower <Protectcoittower@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; asha.safai@sfgov.org
Subject: FILE NO: 190629: Proposed 50% Park Fees Increase and Removal of Board of Supervisors Authority to Set Visitor Entrance Fees to Botanical Gardens, Japanese Tea Garden, Conservatory of Flowers, and Coit Tower Elevator – OPPOSE

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Protect Coit Tower

June 14, 2019

Chair Sandra Lee Fewer and Members

Budget and Finance Committee

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall

San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Proposed 50% Park Fees Increase and Removal of Board of Supervisors**

Authority to Set Visitor Entrance Fees to Botanical Gardens, Japanese Tea Garden, Conservatory of Flowers, and Coit Tower Elevator – <u>OPPOSE</u>

FILE NO: 190629 – Scheduled for Budget and Finance Hearing on June 19, 2019

Dear Chair Fewer and Members of the Budget and Finance Committee:

On behalf of Protect Coit Tower, a nonprofit organization dedicated to celebrating, preserving, and educating the public about San Francisco's Coit Tower and its historic New Deal murals, I write to urge you to reject the Mayor's proposed ordinance that would grant the General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department unlimited discretion to raise park visitor admission fees by up to 50% at any time, for as long as they wish, and for such arbitrary reasons as the weather.

I oppose this ordinance as a whole and specifically as it relates to Coit Tower.

The proposed ordinance as a whole would fundamentally undermine the crucial oversight of the management of our city's parks provided by the Board of Supervisors. The ordinance would effectively remove Supervisors from decision-making authority over setting park fees by empowering a political appointee who is unaccountable to the public with the unilateral discretion to raise park fees for people who cannot prove they are San Francisco residents by 50% above the fixed park fees that are thoughtfully and carefully set by the Board of Supervisors. As a general matter, the Board has been the guardian of the idea that the priority for public parks should be to keep them open to the public, not monetized or privatized. By removing the Board from its vital oversight role, this ordinance would shift the decision-making on setting fair and equitable park admission fees out of public view to instead be made in the dark behind closed doors.

Moreover, the ordinance provides wholly arbitrary and truly absurd parameters to supposedly guide the decision by the Department General Manager on when and how much to raise by 50% – or in theory lower by 25% - park fees. For example, the ordinance states that a factor the General Manager could base a 50% park fee increase on is "weather conditions." However, the ordinance does not state whether this means that fees would be increased by 50% in sunny, hot weather (such as our recent string of 90 degree days) since people may be more likely to visit parks on beautiful days or

whether this means fees would be decreased by 25% on sunny, hot days as a way to encourage visitors to take advantage of the shade by the flora in the Botanical Gardens or cool down inside the Conservatory of Flowers. Would rainy days cause fees to go up by 50% as people flock inside or down by 25% to encourage visitors? What effect would fog have on the General Manager's decision to set park fees – any or none at all?

In addition to generally opposing this ordinance for the above reasons, I urge you to either remove Coit Tower from this ordinance or reject it for the damaging impact it would have on Coit Tower. By lumping Coit Tower into the same category as the three park locations in Golden Gate Park, the "flexible pricing" proposal assumes that random 50% price increases would simply mean that visitors who show up would either pay more than they

expected to pay or go somewhere else. However, unlike the Golden Gate Park locations where there are other visitor options nearby, Coit Tower stands alone on top of Telegraph Hill. If visitors traverse Telegraph Hill based on guidebooks that tell them they will have to pay $9 (the current non-resident fee) to ride the elevator up Coit Tower – but then when they arrive they are sometimes told they will have to pay $13.50 (the proposed increased fee), the likely result will be confusion, frustration, and a slow down to the long lines that already cause some murals to be obscured from view.

The proposed ordinance also violates the will of San Francisco voters. As expressed by voter approval of an official Coit Tower Preservation Policy at the ballot in June 2012's Proposition B, San Francisco voters voted to prioritize the funds received by the City from any concession operations at Coit Tower for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower. In contrast, the proposed ordinance would allow Coit Tower elevator fees to be raised by 50% but devote none of that revenue to improving access to Coit Tower or supporting programs that enable children or families in need to visit Coit Tower. This would directly violate the will of voters when they passed Prop. B.

I am appalled that, at a time when the City is flush with cash, instead of increasing public access to our public parks by lowering fees – or eliminating them altogether at places like the Botanical Gardens that were fee-free until 2010 – the Mayor and Recreation and Parks Department are instead proposing to hike park fees by 50% at some of San Francisco's most treasured places. Instead of nickel and diming our visitors – and residents who fail to provide ID to prove they live here – as this ordinance would do, this is a time that the City should be finding creative ways to encourage more people to visit our parks to show off the magic of San Francisco.

<u>I urge you to reject the Mayor's proposed 50% Park Fee Price Hike ordinance</u>.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Golinger
Protect Coit Tower

cc: All Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor London Breed

www.ProtectCoitTower.org

June 14, 2019

Chair Sandra Lee Fewer and Members
Budget and Finance Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Proposed 50% Park Fees Increase and Removal of Board of Supervisors Authority to Set Visitor Entrance Fees to Botanical Gardens, Japanese Tea Garden, Conservatory of Flowers, and Coit Tower Elevator – OPPOSE**

FILE NO: 190629 – Scheduled for Budget and Finance Hearing on June 19, 2019

Dear Chair Fewer and Members of the Budget and Finance Committee:

On behalf of Protect Coit Tower, a nonprofit organization dedicated to celebrating, preserving, and educating the public about San Francisco's Coit Tower and its historic New Deal murals, I write to urge you to reject the Mayor's proposed ordinance that would grant the General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department unlimited discretion to raise park visitor admission fees by up to 50% at any time, for as long as they wish, and for such arbitrary reasons as the weather.

I oppose this ordinance as a whole and specifically as it relates to Coit Tower.

The proposed ordinance as a whole would fundamentally undermine the crucial oversight of the management of our city's parks provided by the Board of Supervisors. The ordinance would effectively remove Supervisors from decision-making authority over setting park fees by empowering a political appointee who is unaccountable to the public with the unilateral discretion to raise park fees for people who cannot prove they are San Francisco residents by 50% above the fixed park fees that are thoughtfully and carefully set by the Board of Supervisors. As a general matter, the Board has been the guardian of the idea that the priority for public parks should be to keep them open to the public, not monetized or privatized. By removing the Board from its vital oversight role, this ordinance would shift the decision-making on setting fair and equitable park admission fees out of public view to instead be made in the dark behind closed doors.

Moreover, the ordinance provides wholly arbitrary and truly absurd parameters to supposedly guide the decision by the Department General Manager on when and how much to raise by 50% – or in theory lower by 25% - park fees. For example, the ordinance states that a factor the General Manager could base a 50% park fee increase on is "weather conditions." However, the ordinance does not state whether this means that fees would be increased by 50% in sunny, hot weather (such as our recent string of 90 degree days) since people may be more likely to visit parks on beautiful days or

whether this means fees would be decreased by 25% on sunny, hot days as a way to encourage visitors to take advantage of the shade by the flora in the Botanical Gardens or cool down inside the Conservatory of Flowers. Would rainy days cause fees to go up by 50% as people flock inside or down by 25% to encourage visitors? What effect would fog have on the General Manager's decision to set park fees – any or none at all?

In addition to generally opposing this ordinance for the above reasons, I urge you to either remove Coit Tower from this ordinance or reject it for the damaging impact it would have on Coit Tower. By lumping Coit Tower into the same category as the three park locations in Golden Gate Park, the "flexible pricing" proposal assumes that random 50% price increases would simply mean that visitors who show up would either pay more than they expected to pay or go somewhere else. However, unlike the Golden Gate Park locations where there are other visitor options nearby, Coit Tower stands alone on top of Telegraph Hill. If visitors traverse Telegraph Hill based on guidebooks that tell them they will have to pay $9 (the current non-resident fee) to ride the elevator up Coit Tower – but then when they arrive they are sometimes told they will have to pay $13.50 (the proposed increased fee), the likely result will be confusion, frustration, and a slow down to the long lines that already cause some murals to be obscured from view.

The proposed ordinance also violates the will of San Francisco voters. As expressed by voter approval of an official Coit Tower Preservation Policy at the ballot in June 2012's Proposition B, San Francisco voters voted to prioritize the funds received by the City from any concession operations at Coit Tower for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower. In contrast, the proposed ordinance would allow Coit Tower elevator fees to be raised by 50% but devote none of that revenue to improving access to Coit Tower or supporting programs that enable children or families in need to visit Coit Tower. This would directly violate the will of voters when they passed Prop. B.

I am appalled that, at a time when the City is flush with cash, instead of increasing public access to our public parks by lowering fees – or eliminating them altogether at places like the Botanical Gardens that were fee-free until 2010 – the Mayor and Recreation and Parks Department are instead proposing to hike park fees by 50% at some of San Francisco's most treasured places. Instead of nickel and diming our visitors – and residents who fail to provide ID to prove they live here – as this ordinance would do, this is a time that the City should be finding creative ways to encourage more people to visit our parks to show off the magic of San Francisco.

<u>I urge you to reject the Mayor's proposed 50% Park Fee Price Hike ordinance</u>.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Golinger
Protect Coit Tower

cc: All Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor London Breed

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Board File No. 190437: SPUR supports putting the affordable "by-right" charter amendment on the ballot
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:22:00 PM
Attachments:	SPUR supports putting affordable by right measure on ballot.pdf

From: Kristy Wang <kwang@spur.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 23, 2019 4:56 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Alicia John-Baptiste <ajohn-baptiste@spur.org>; Sarah Karlinsky <skarlinsky@spur.org>; Tomiquia Moss <tmoss@hamiltonfamilies.org>; Fregosi, Ian (BOS) <ian.fregosi@sfgov.org>; Herzstein, Daniel (BOS) <daniel.herzstein@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Quan, Daisy (BOS) <daisy.quan@sfgov.org>; Cancino, Juan Carlos (BOS) <juancarlos.cancino@sfgov.org>; RivamonteMesa, Abigail (BOS) <abigail.rivamontemesa@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Sandoval, Suhagey (BOS) <suhagey.sandoval@sfgov.org>; Karunaratne, Kanishka (MYR) <kanishka.cheng@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; YIMBY Action <laura@yimbyaction.org>; Todd David <todd@sfhac.org>
Subject: Board File No. 190437: SPUR supports putting the affordable "by-right" charter amendment on the ballot

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

SPUR urges you to support placing this proposed charter amendment (Board File No. 190437) on the ballot in order to streamline the review and approval of 100% affordable housing and housing for educators. We believe the passage of this measure will have a real impact on how quickly and cost-effectively the city and industry will be able to produce types of housing that are urgently needed in San Francisco.

While San Francisco has gone far beyond its neighbors and peers in dedicating resources to affordable housing, this city is still far behind in producing the amount of housing that is actually needed to keep up with population growth, particularly for low-, moderate- and even middle-income households. This has come about for a whole host of reasons, including a long history of insufficient funding for affordable housing at all levels of government, the swiftly rising cost of construction, a shortage of construction labor, widespread NIMBYism and a complicated and lengthy approvals and permitting process.

Clearly there is no silver bullet, so we must collectively take a variety of steps to remedy these

barriers. This measure will address our infamously complex approvals process that leaves open many opportunities for opposition to delay or halt affordable housing. It will require the city to create a more efficient and less risky approvals process, resulting in quicker delivery and less expensive production of housing.

SPUR believes that the full Board of Supervisors supports the creation of housing for educators and low- and moderate-income households. Putting this measure on the ballot will take an important step toward delivering that housing more quickly and for less cost.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Kristy Wang

Kristy Wang, LEED AP
Community Planning Policy Director
SPUR • Ideas + Action for a Better City
(415) 644-4884
(415) 425-8460 m
kwang@spur.org

SPUR | Facebook | Twitter | Join | Get Newsletters

Join us for the SPUR Summer Parties!
Reserve your spot today >>

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: 6/25/19 Agenda items 45/46: affirm Planning Commission finding on SWL Lot 330
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 12:45:00 PM

From: Alice Rogers <arcomnsf@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 3:34 PM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Forbes, Elaine (PRT) <elaine.forbes@sfport.com>; Cohen, Emily (DPH) <emily.cohen@sfdph.org>
Subject: 6/25/19 Agenda items 45/46: affirm Planning Commission finding on SWL Lot 330

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President Yee, and Honorable Supervisors Brown, Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton,

I am writing in support of the proposed SAFE Navigation Center to be located on a portion of Seawall lot 330, and asking you to affirm the Planning Commission's findings. This proposed center is a time-delimited (two to four years) interim use and thus subject to more limited review criteria according to the Port's Waterfront Plan than the longterm (66-year) projects that trigger the full panoply of multi-agency, multi-year, multi-commission evaluations and findings. It also furthers the Port's public service, diversity and inclusion, and sustainability goals in ways that the current interim use parking lot does not.

Our South Beach, Rincon, eastern SoMa neighborhood residents have, in my 25+-year experience here, been close to evenly divided on the hot-button projects that have surfaced in our area, with opponents to a given project being the most active. I want to be sure that the voices of those residents who do not oppose this limited-term use are also represented.

My support, however, is conditional upon the full enforcement of the Good Neighbor Policies developed to ensure that this center—as a hub for healing and moving people out of homelessness—does not also turn the adjacent neighborhoods into a safe haven where guests of the center can practice destructive behaviors that are not allowed in the center itself. We see the suffering and the humiliating conditions in which those without shelter are living on our sidewalks now and we want all hands on to move these souls to help, health, and lives of dignity. We need the full faith and action of the City to support the positive trajectory, inside the center and in the area around it.

Sincerely,
Alice Rogers

.....
Alice Rogers
10 South Park St
Studio 2
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: Vote on Embarcadero Navigation Center
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 5:07:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Melanie Scardina <scardinama@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 5:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>
Subject: Vote on Embarcadero Navigation Center

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors

Please vote “No" on the Embarcadero Navigation Center tomorrow. While I understand there is pressure to add shelter beds, I don’t agree that a navigation center is appropriate in our tourist areas. At least a third of our homeless population suffers from drug or alcohol addiction. Drug and alcohol use is not permitted inside the shelters, so they hang out in the adjacent neighborhoods to feed their addictions, to panhandle or commit petty crimes to get money for drugs. The newly revitalized Embarcadero is truly a jewel in our city. Adding a navigation center in this particular location will further tarnish our city’s image and impact tourist dollars. A better location would be Cow Palace or Candlestick Point, where there would be lesser impact on tourism and residential areas. Thank you for your consideration.

Thank you
M. Scardina

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Navigation Center on the Embarcadero
Date:	Tuesday, June 25, 2019 12:45:00 PM

From: Have Mercy <have2mercy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 11:59 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Navigation Center on the Embarcadero

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

As a resident and voter of San Francisco, I will like to let you know that I am against the building of the Navigation Center on the Embarcadero.

The reason I am against this proposal is because I do not think the location is practical. The location is not near efficient and reliable transportation. In addition, the location is not near any social services. In addition, the navigation would be a burden on the tiny fire station. I don't think this is a well thought out proposal and that it should not be fast tracked.

I do think having a navigation center is a good idea. How about building a navigation center near civic center or on van ness which is close to transportation and city services.

I have spoken to many people on this issue and not a single person thinks the location of the Navigation Center is a practical idea.

A little about me. I am a long term resident of San Francisco. I do not live anywhere near the Embarcadero. I am not a home owner and have a modest income. I care about the people living on our streets. So please do not think all the people that are opposing the center are doing it bc of NIMBY.

Thank you for your consideration.

From:	SF Forest
To:	MOD, (ADM); DPW, Urbanforestry (DPW); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Cc:	Froehlich, David (DPW); Short, Carla (DPW); Buck, Chris (DPW); Bentz, Sally (DPW); DPW, Urban Forestry Permits (DPW); Czajkowski, Matt (DPW); Ong, Bryan (DPW); zkarnazes@gmail.com
Subject:	Fwd: Accessibility for Deforestation In Our City
Date:	Sunday, June 23, 2019 6:14:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor's Office on Disability, DPW, BUF, City Supervisors,

This letter is to voice our strong support for Zachary Karnazes' request that the Bureau of Urban Forestry provide an accessible database of the trees to be cut down.
We agree that "it is sick and wrong that disabled citizens are not given proper notice in an accessible way to voice their input." Such a data base would benefit all San Franciscans and be a great tool for the BUF and department land managers.

The database should contain:
- The trees slated for removal, posted in the data base at the same time as the physical notices are posted on trees including location, responsible land manager, size(diameter at breast height), species and reason for removal
- It would be useful to include trees that have fallen due to natural causes.

The other part of San Francisco'e tree puzzle is to maintain a count of trees planted and to track their survival.
- The database should include location of trees planted, responsible land manager, size(gallons), species and date of planting.
- Plantings that are not trees should NOT be included. Per the SFRPD Natural Areas management plan, anything not expected to grow a primary vertical trunk 15 feet tall is not a tree.
- The data base would need to track survival of the planted trees. This would be the biggest challenge.

Tracking street trees alone ignores a huge part of our urban forest, the trees on lands, managed by RPD, PUC, and other public lands. These must be included.
Such a database is an essential tool for San Francisco to manage its urban forest. Right now, we do not know if we are winning or losing the battle to maintain our already inadequate tree canopy.

Sincerely,
San Francisco Forest Alliance

San Francisco Forest Alliance is a 501(c)4 not-for-profit organization with a mission of inclusive environmentalism. We fight to protect our environment through outreach and providing information. We oppose the unnecessary destruction of trees, oppose the use of toxic

herbicides in parks and public lands, and support public access to our parks and conservation of our tree canopy. We stand for transparency in the use of public funds.

From: Zach [mailto:zkarnazes@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2019 3:19 AM
Cc: SF Forest <sfforestNews@gmail.com>
Subject: Accessibility for Deforestation In Our City

Dear Mayor's Office on Disability, DPW, SF Forest Alliance, City Supervisors, and other concerned parties,

The Bureau of Urban Forestry has taken it upon themselves again to cut down beautiful, healthy full grown trees in our neighborhood. Due to my disabilities I am not able to leave home often. When I am able to leave home my mobility limitations prevent me from walking around the neighborhood to try and spot which of these trees have "public" notices saying which ones are to be cut down.

I have requested multiple times, in writing and in person at public meetings, that the Bureau of Urban Forestry provide an accessible database for the mobility impaired and the vision impaired to learn about which trees are being cut down and destroyed in our neighborhoods. For years they have ignored my requests. It is sick and wrong that disabled citizens are not given proper notice in an accessible way to voice our input on the destruction going on in our neighborhoods.

Disabled people have a right to know what is going on in their neighborhoods just as everyone else. **Just because we are sick in bed for long periods of time, have vision impairments, or cannot canvass our neighborhoods** does not mean that we should be excluded from the protest process for which trees BUF plans to cut down.

I have a video posted online for your consideration here:
https://youtu.be/EZ7UnKwX1lA

I strongly urge the Mayor's Office and Disability to coordinate with BUF and DPW staff to provide access for disabled people to obtain the needed notice and

engage in the protest process when trees in our neighborhoods are slated for destruction.

Chris Buck and BUF / DPW, please consider this email my official protest for the trees you are trying to cut down on 24th Street. There are more with notices at the BART intersection as well, across from the McDonalds.

Thank you for your time,

-Zachary Karnazes

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: UNITE HERE Local 2"s Support of Supervisor Mar's Resolution in Support of SB 343 (Uniform Healthcare Data Disclosure)
Date:	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:26:00 PM
Attachments:	11,000 People Who Prepare Your Airline ...sidering a Strike - The New York Times.pdf Local 2 Support for SB 343 Healthcare Disclosure - SF BOS (6-17-19).pdf

From: Mario Yedidia <myedidia@unitehere.org>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 4:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: UNITE HERE Local 2's Support of Supervisor Mar's Resolution in Support of SB 343 (Uniform Healthcare Data Disclosure)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Monday, June 10, 2019
Re: Support of Supervisor Mar's Resolution in Support of SB 343 (Uniform Healthcare Data Disclosure)

Dear Honorable Members:

I write on behalf of the 12,000 hotel and food service workers who are members of UNITE HERE Local 2. Last fall, 2,500 workers at seven Marriott hotels in San Francisco went on strike for 61 days because one job should be enough to live with dignity and respect when you work for the wealthiest hotelier in history.

But despite the historic contract our members won in that strike, the increasing cost of health care continues to threaten their livelihoods. Health care costs are more than $13 per hour in San Francisco's union hotels.

At the other end of the spectrum, tens of thousands of airline catering workers across the U.S. who are members of UNITE HERE (including some 2,000 members of Local 2) are currently taking strike votes; their wages are too low, and the health care coverage they are offered by their employers is substandard. (See attached New York Times article, "11,000 People Who Prepare Your Airline Food Are Considering a Strike," June 4, 2019.)

California State Senate Bill 343 is a commonsense measure that would bring Kaiser's state regulatory reporting requirements in line with what is required of other health plans and hospitals. For the past seven years, UNITE HERE has been advancing state legislation to bring transparency to health care prices. SB 343 is of a piece with that goal.

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan is our state's largest insurer, and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals has more hospital beds than any other system in the state. It is eminently reasonable to expect both entities to report in the same ways we require of Kaiser's competitors.

We urge the board to approve Supervisor Mar's resolution declaring the City & County's support for state Senate Bill 343.

Thank you.

Anand Singh
President
UNITE HERE Local 2

UNITE HERE!

Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Monday, June 10, 2019

Dear Honorable Members:

I write on behalf of the 12,000 hotel and food service workers who are members of UNITE HERE Local 2. Last fall, 2,500 workers at seven Marriott hotels in San Francisco went on strike for 61 days because one job should be enough to live with dignity and respect when you work for the wealthiest hotelier in history.

But despite the historic contract our members won in that strike, the increasing cost of health care continues to threaten their livelihoods. Health care costs are more than $13 per hour in San Francisco's union hotels.

At the other end of the spectrum, tens of thousands of airline catering workers across the U.S. who are members of UNITE HERE (including some 2,000 members of Local 2) are currently taking strike votes; their wages are too low, and the health care coverage they are offered by their employers is substandard. (See attached New York *Times* article, "11,000 People Who Prepare Your Airline Food Are Considering a Strike," June 4, 2019.)

California State Senate Bill 343 is a commonsense measure that would bring Kaiser's state regulatory reporting requirements in line with what is required of other health plans and hospitals. For the past seven years, UNITE HERE has been advancing state legislation to bring transparency to health care prices. SB 343 is of a piece with that goal.

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan is our state's largest insurer, and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals has more hospital beds than any other system in the state. It is eminently reasonable to expect both entities to report in the same ways we require of Kaiser's competitors.

We urge the board to approve Supervisor Mar's resolution declaring the City & County's support for state Senate Bill 343.

Thank you.

Anand Singh
President
UNITE HERE Local 2

Anand Singh
President

Chito Cuéllar
Vice-President

Tina Chen
Secretary-Treasurer

209 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA, 94102 • phone: 415.864.8770 • fax: 415.864.4158
209 Highland Ave., Burlingame, CA, 94010 • phone: 650.344.6827 • fax: 650.344.9406

Engineers & Scientists of California
Local 20, IFPTE AFL-CIO/CLC
810 Clay Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel 510 238 8320
Fax 510 238 8324

June 17, 2019

The Honorable Supervisor Mar
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: File No. 190690 Resolution Supporting California State Senate Bill No. 343 (Pan) - Uniform Healthcare Data Disclosure - **SUPPORT**

Dear Supervisor Mar,

As a representative of more than 1,500 Clinical Lab Scientists, Genetic Counselors and Coordinators, Medical Laboratory Technicians, Optometrists and Optometric Assistants, and Outpatient Rehab Therapists at Northern California Kaiser Permanente and an active participant in the Kaiser Permanente Labor-Management Partnership, Engineers and Scientists of California Local 20, IFPTE writes today in support of your resolution in supporting California State Senate Bill No. 343 (Pan).

ESC Local 20 is a longtime supporter of transparency across the healthcare industry in order to maintain affordable healthcare costs for consumers, employers, and taxpayers. Rising healthcare costs have created a crisis of affordability for working families in California. Uniform reporting requirements will aid employers and employees in bargaining for affordable health benefits and will help policymakers to understand the functioning of California's healthcare market.

In 2019, it is no longer fair or reasonable to exempt Kaiser from the transparency requirements which apply to all other integrated delivery models, and to all other health plans and hospital systems. It is for those reasons that we are proud to support SB 343 and thank you for your resolution in support of Senator Dr Richard Pan's legislation.

Sincerely,

Jonathan T. Wright
Legislative Director

The New York Times

11,000 People Who Prepare Your Airline Food Are Considering a Strike

By Noam Scheiber

June 4, 2019

President Trump announced a deal to end the government shutdown in January after a shortage of air traffic controllers briefly stopped flights into La Guardia Airport. At the time, many concluded that workers' impact on travel had led the White House to retreat.

"I think it's really obvious to all aviation workers that that's what happened," said Sara Nelson, president of the Association of Flight Attendants. "There are also many people in government who echo" that analysis.

Now, other airport workers are testing that proposition.

This month, about 11,000 airline catering employees — the people who prepare and transport food and beverages that millions of passengers consume on flights each year — will vote on a first step toward a possible labor stoppage. Many make the minimum wage in their areas, or less, and toil in harsh conditions with limited benefits. But collectively, they have the power to disrupt the air travel network.

"The smallest mishap or interruption in any kind of service ripples out," said Liesl Orenic, a labor historian at Dominican University in Illinois who has studied airport workers. "If a plane doesn't get catered, it can interrupt all the people getting on that plane and all the other flights that plane has to do."

For decades, as unionization rates have fallen and the country has moved to a service economy, organized labor has found that it has less power to affect employers' bottom lines.

Even successful labor actions in the last few years — like the Fight for $15 campaign, which has helped raise wages in fast food and other industries — have tended to bring political pressure through sophisticated public-relations tactics rather than attempts to directly inflict economic losses.

But the muscle-flexing by airport workers may reflect the return of a model in which aggrieved employees threaten the wheels of commerce.

During the government shutdown, an increase in the number of air traffic controllers calling in sick prompted the Federal Aviation Administration to halt flights headed for La Guardia. (Their union said that the delays had resulted from the absence of a small number of controllers acting individually amid the strains of the shutdown and that it would oppose a coordinated sickout.)

More recently, mechanics at Southwest Airlines won raises after a large increase in the number of maintenance issues they flagged forced flight delays and cancellations.

D. Taylor, president of the hospitality-industry union Unite Here, which represents a majority of airline catering workers, did not rule out the possibility that his members' actions could have similar effects.

Mr. Blanco and Maria Jose Leira, a member of the staff of Unite Here Local 100, encouraged Sky Chefs drivers last week to sign a pledge to vote in favor of authorizing a strike. Desiree Rios for The New York Times

"We'll do whatever it takes, within legal means, to make sure workers get good contracts," Mr. Taylor said.

The workers are primarily employees of two large catering companies, LSG Sky Chefs and Gate Gourmet, although United Airlines employs some directly. As a group, they are among the lowest-paid workers at airports, especially among those whose labor directly affects operations on flights.

The union is proposing a national wage floor of $15 per hour for all catering workers and wants the companies to make their health insurance substantially more affordable.

Preston Strickland, who works at the Sky Chefs kitchen serving Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, said he typically prepares over 1,500 cold entrees in a shift, which he spends in an area kept at 40 degrees or below.

Mr. Strickland makes a little over $11 per hour after more than four years on the job and cannot afford health insurance on his company's plan, he said.

"I prefer to pay my phone bill, car insurance," he said. "If I get sick, I go to the emergency room." He recently spent several months homeless because he didn't have money for rent.

A Sky Chefs spokesman said the union had agreed to workers' pay rates in previous rounds of negotiation, the most recent of which began in 2015. The union also agreed to allow those pay rates to supersede state or local wage laws.

Workers also complain about the companies' tendency to run kitchens with too few workers, too little equipment and haphazard upkeep.

Juan Blanco, a driver with Sky Chefs at a kitchen serving Kennedy International Airport in New York, said a door on his truck had a broken spring and fell on his head in 2017, leaving him with a concussion and a shoulder injury requiring surgery. He was out of work for weeks and relied on workers' compensation payments to cover his hospital bills.

The Food and Drug Administration has validated some of these concerns, citing the catering companies for numerous food-safety infractions over the years.

In March 2018, the agency sent Gate Gourmet a warning letter regarding its workplace near Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, where inspectors observed "dead apparent nymph and adult cockroaches too numerous to count" in areas where food was cooked, as well as "a heavy buildup of more than a day's accumulation of grease, food deposits and general filth."

The agency said in a follow-up letter two months later that the company had addressed its concerns. A Gate Gourmet spokeswoman said the company had worked closely with the F.D.A. to correct the issues.

Preston Strickland said he made a little over $11 an hour in a Sky Chefs kitchen serving Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport. JerSean Golatt for The New York Times

Unlike most private-sector workers, caterers and other airline workers are covered by the Railway Labor Act, whose purpose is to avoid chaos in the rail and airline industries because of their importance to interstate commerce. That means workers don't have the right to strike without permission — officially a "release" from mediation — from a federal agency known as the National Mediation Board, which rarely grants it.

But as recent events have demonstrated, there is a wide gulf between labor harmony and a formal strike, and workers have ample opportunity within that range to affect air travel. During the stalemate at Southwest, the company accused its mechanics of effectively grounding planes over minor glitches, such as missing row numbers. The union denied these allegations.

Some workers in airline-related jobs have long been leery of taking an aggressive approach to labor issues. Air traffic controllers were traumatized for decades by the mass firing of controllers at the hands of the Reagan administration over an illegal strike in 1981. Until this year, they tended to avoid any significant action that could be construed as coordinated.

Some economically vulnerable workers have been less assertive as well, but experts say catering workers have underappreciated leverage. According to Robert W. Mann, a longtime airline industry consultant, there is far less margin for error built into the air travel system compared with two or three decades ago.

If a flight is supposed to arrive at Gate G17, Mr. Mann posited, "and half an hour before departure it flips over to Gate A24, the logistics of getting that catering to arrive at the now distant Gate A24 in time to do everything else in the sequence you have to do it is quite daunting." A team of less than fully motivated workers could throw the whole process off.

In principle, the airlines could scale back in-flight food and beverage service. But they would risk a backlash from passengers, one that might be amplified by other airport workers.

"We will also take part in helping to inform the public more generally about what disruption this would have in our ability to provide service," said Ms. Nelson, the flight attendants' leader.

The confrontation looms as labor disruptions appear to be rising, albeit in vastly different contexts.

New England workers at the grocery chain Stop & Shop won wage increases and preserved health care benefits that the company had threatened after more than 30,000 of them staged an 11-day strike in April that cost the company an estimated $100 million.

That followed last year's teacher walkouts, which shut down schools in several states for days. Over all, the number of workers who took part in strikes involving more than 1,000 workers last year reached its highest level since the mid-1980s; the number of days lost to such strikes was the highest in 15 years.

The National Mediation Board, where Republicans hold a majority, appears to appreciate the high stakes for management and labor that may be converging at airports.

This year, the board proposed a rule that would make it easier to eliminate airport and railway unions. Although the rule had long been in the works, according to the agency, the timing of its release struck union leaders as intriguing: It came less than one week after the government shutdown ended.

Follow Noam Scheiber on Twitter: @noamscheiber.

Susan C. Beachy contributed research.

A version of this article appears in print on June 4, 2019, on Page B1 of the New York edition with the headline: Air Travel Workers Test Newfound Might

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: ESC Local 20, IFPTE Support for Agenda Item 56
Date:	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:29:00 PM
Attachments:	ESC Mar 343 Support Letter.pdf

From: Jonathan Wright <jwright@ifpte20.org>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 4:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: ESC Local 20, IFPTE Support for Agenda Item 56

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Jonathan T. Wright
Legislative Director
Engineers and Scientists of California
IFPTE Local 20, AFL-CIO & CLC
(510) 384-7088
www.ifpte20.org

Engineers & Scientists of California
Local 20, IFPTE AFL-CIO/CLC
810 Clay Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel 510 238 8320
Fax 510 238 8324

June 17, 2019

The Honorable Supervisor Mar
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: File No. 190690 Resolution Supporting California State Senate Bill No. 343 (Pan) - Uniform Healthcare Data Disclosure - **SUPPORT**

Dear Supervisor Mar,

As a representative of more than 1,500 Clinical Lab Scientists, Genetic Counselors and Coordinators, Medical Laboratory Technicians, Optometrists and Optometric Assistants, and Outpatient Rehab Therapists at Northern California Kaiser Permanente and an active participant in the Kaiser Permanente Labor-Management Partnership, Engineers and Scientists of California Local 20, IFPTE writes today in support of your resolution in supporting California State Senate Bill No. 343 (Pan).

ESC Local 20 is a longtime supporter of transparency across the healthcare industry in order to maintain affordable healthcare costs for consumers, employers, and taxpayers. Rising healthcare costs have created a crisis of affordability for working families in California. Uniform reporting requirements will aid employers and employees in bargaining for affordable health benefits and will help policymakers to understand the functioning of California's healthcare market.

In 2019, it is no longer fair or reasonable to exempt Kaiser from the transparency requirements which apply to all other integrated delivery models, and to all other health plans and hospital systems. It is for those reasons that we are proud to support SB 343 and thank you for your resolution in support of Senator Dr Richard Pan's legislation.

Sincerely,

Jonathan T. Wright
Legislative Director

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Funding for Larkin Street Youth Services Housing Programs,
Date:	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:46:00 PM

From: Marvis Phillips <marvisphillips@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 1:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ilsa Lund <ILund@larkinstreetyouth.org>
Subject: Funding for Larkin Street Youth Services Housing Programs,

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please forward this letter to all the Supervisors,

Dear supervisors,
I am reaching out to you to ask you to support the Larkin Street Youth Services Housing Programs the Budget cycle. A reduction of funding would lead to a loss of extremely badly need funds to keep the following housing programs open and functioning. The 'Diamond Youth Shelter', 'Geary House', & 'Castro Youth House Initiative'. Without your support Larkin Street Youth Services will need to reduce these criticality important services serving under 18, our LGBTQ-QY & Transgender Youth. As well as those who are 18-21 and either working or going to school.
Thank you for your contuned support for Larkin Street Youth Services and our youth in the community.

Sincerely,
Marvis J. Phillips
*Co-Founder Larkin Street Youth Services (1984)
*Board Chair
*District 6 Community Planners
--
Marvis J. Phillips
Board Chair
District 6 Community Planners

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS)
Subject: FW: Haney Budget Request For $7.5 Million In Rent Relief
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:27:00 PM

From: Jordan Davis <jodav1026@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 12:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: Haney Budget Request For $7.5 Million In Rent Relief

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

You probably have heard a lot from people about the issue of rent burdens in master leased hotels, and I wanted to finally make my case for it to be included.

As you all very well know, my hunger strike has been 14 days and counting, and the ending of this hunger strike will be contingent on a commitment to rent relief for tenants in master leased hotels, many of which are paying 50% or more of their income, I am one of them.

To me, this should not even be an issue, I don't know why this hasn't been addressed for so long. I am currently struggling with rent burdens, even volunteering to serve on one of our city's boards/commissions doesn't mean that I am immune from this. And I don't want good wishes or thoughts and prayers, I want action. And I want everyone to do their part, because I have not seen the initiative that I'd like to see.

I have no permanent friends, nor permanent enemies, only permanent interests. Haney's budget ask of $7.5 million is reasonable, and I didn't want to do this hunger strike, nor did I want to be on the front page of today's Examiner, but circumstances beyond my control forced me to.

Can I also say I hate it when District 6, 9, and 10 (three districts that need equity) get shafted. Because this is just one of the major issues facing these three high need districts, and we need more neighborhood equity in general, and this is part of that.

I don't know what will happen next, but there are real harms being faced here by us tenants in master leased hotels, and you all need to do the right thing.

In solidarity and for housing justice.

-Jordan Davis

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Proposed legislation
Date: Monday, July 1, 2019 4:31:00 PM

From: Ben Najmark <najmarkb@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 29, 2019 3:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposed legislation

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi my name is Benjamin Najmark,

I'm not sure where to start or who to email. Or how to effect change.
As a Bartender living in the greater Bay Area and having worked at Att park and Pedro's across the street. And many other fast paced establishments. I must inform you of the waste that is produced in settings such as this. San Francisco was the first to ban single use plastic bags. And I feel it should be the first to ban single use plastic cups in Bars and restaurants and at events unless the are biodegradable. The amount of plastic waste produced is staggering. Often for 1 oz of alcohol. Two cups are used.
I'm not sure if this is the appropriate place to contact. If I can be directed to the correct place to effect change that would be appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration.
Benjamin

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Please vote for Muni reliability
Date: Monday, July 1, 2019 4:34:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 29, 2019 6:15 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please vote for Muni reliability

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to vote against the proposal to direct Muni's ERAF funds for anything that does not improve service now. With large population growth and lacking investment in public transit gridlock gets worse.

Plan for the population growth today and for tomorrow!

Riders are suffering constant delays and breakdowns. In the face of record levels of street congestion, people are still opting to get into private vehicles if they can, because Muni just can't be counted on.

Please dedicate Muni's ERAF funds to proactive vehicle and track maintenance, new switches and signals, and transit priority - especially for surface light rail service. These are the kinds of funding priorities that will get riders where they need to go and make transit more competitive.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman D11 resident and transit rider

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Aaron Goodman
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Green spent on green? (Ag D11)
Date:	Friday, June 28, 2019 6:40:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Who speaks for the trees

With a 12 billion budget we need to also focus on green environmental policies including street trees and mandating protection of trees.

Neighbors remove trees and pave backyards it's an environmental impact so legislate against tree and landscape removal in backyard in sf

And require tree plantings on streets when any remodel work is done and no tree exists.

Also for removal of trees equal replacement or creation of new open space citywide...

Ag D11

https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/SF-s-tree-planting-budget-surges-but-removals-14056408.php

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: Spraying Round Up in Glen Canyon
Date:	Monday, July 1, 2019 4:35:00 PM

From: phyllis@ball.net <phyllis@ball.net>
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 8:10 PM
To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: Spraying Round Up in Glen Canyon

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I understand Parks & Recs recently sprayed Roundup with its cancer-linked ingredient glyphosate in Glen Park.

Why do we spray a cancer-linked ingredient in a park where children and dogs play in the grass?

Just a few months ago a unanimous jury in federal court in SF awarded damages to a plaintiff because Monsanto did not warm him of the cancer risks of Roundup. Last August a federal court in SF awarded over $200M to a plaintiff with cancer from Roundup.

Roundup is now banned in Europe as a carcinogen.

I understand there was a sign at one entrance to Glen Park notifying the public while Roundup was being sprayed. But the cancer risk of glyphosate is not limited to the time it is actively being sprayed. The cancer risk persists after the spraying has been completed. Don't residents deserve to know which fields have been treated with cancer-linked chemicals, so they can keep their children and dogs away? If the chemical is persistent, shouldn't the warning signs be persistent?

But moreover, if the purpose of the field is for recreation, why would we ever spray them with dangerous and persistent chemicals?

Please prioritize the health of your constituents over other factors like cost and convenience.

Phyllis Ball
phyllis@ball.net
249 Jersey St (in Noe Valley)
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: FW: [Nicotine Policy] San Francisco Board of Supervisors to Vote Tuesday on Banning the Retail Sale of Cigarettes and Marijuana
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:23:00 PM

From: Joel Nitzkin <jlnitzkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 23, 2019 4:59 AM
To: Michael Siegel <mbsiegel@bu.edu>
Cc: Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; AAPHP Policy Committee <aaphprpl@googlegroups.com>; aaphpboard <aaphpboard@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Re: [Nicotine Policy] San Francisco Board of Supervisors to Vote Tuesday on Banning the Retail Sale of Cigarettes and Marijuana

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This bit of satire is deadly serious. It shows the adverse impact when a supposedly trustworthy authority figure, in an excess of zeal for publicity and political action, purposely misleads trusting political leaders with outright lies to the effect that e-cigs are worse than cigarettes, that they recruit teens to cigarettes and that they don't help smokers quit. In the world of tobacco-control advocates, an esteemed position within the tobacco control community and funding from FDA are more dependent on the zeal with which they pursue an anti-all-things-tobacco agenda, than the quality and accuracy of the so-called science they generate,

E-cigarettes are not risk-free, but they do offer substantial benefits for adult smokers, teen smokers and would-be smokers; and persons who benefit from self-administered nicotine for their management of their schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, Parkinson's disease and other disorders. The fact that e-cigarettes have not been approved by FDA is because FDA has not yet decided what standards to set for these products, leaving potential small-business applicants with no feasible way to prepare an application.

This proposed action (banning e-cigs while allowing continuing sale of cigarettes and marijuana) will benefit the reputations, and probably the financial support of the advocates who led them to this unwise action. It will enhance sales and profits for the big-tobacco cigarette companies and cigarette bootleggers. It will hurt local teens, adults and business owners.

I therefore urge the SF Board of Supervisors to seek a second opinion and more detail from Dr. Siegel or myself, so we can provide, with references, a more rational view of of what the Board should do if it's goal is to protect the health of the SF population.

Joel L. Nitzkin, MD, MPH, DPA
JLN, MD Associates, LLC
4939 Chestnut Street
New Orleans, LA 70115-2941
Cell Phone 504 606 7043
jlnitzkin@gmail.com
http://jln-md.com

On Sat, Jun 22, 2019 at 12:14 PM Siegel, Michael <mbsiegel@bu.edu> wrote:

> *This story appears on my tobacco news blog today, at: https://tobaccoanalysis.blogspot.com/2019/06/san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-to.html.*
>
> **San Francisco Board of Supervisors to Vote Tuesday on Banning the Retail Sale of Cigarettes and Marijuana**
>
> This Tuesday, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors is scheduled to vote on a proposed ordinance that would ban the sale of cigarettes and marijuana products in the city until the FDA conducts a safety review of these products.
>
> The impetus for the proposed ordinance was new data showing that a large proportion of San Francisco youths are still smoking and that the use of marijuana may even be increasing, especially with the recent legalization of recreational marijuana use. The city attorney explained that: "The epidemic is real. It needed

attention. We felt it was necessary to step in and make sure we were protecting young people on our streets." He criticized the FDA for not properly vetting cigarettes and marijuana and failing to test the safety of these products, saying that the federal government "abdicated" its responsibility and therefore, the city "had to step in."

The supervisor who introduced the ordinance told *The Rest of the Story* that: "there are strong indications that marijuana actually alters receptors in the brain, making youth more susceptible to addiction." He called marijuana a "gateway" to harder drugs, citing evidence that youth who use marijuana are more likely to initiate the use of other drugs, including cigarettes, inhalants, stimulants, and even opiates. He cited a recent statement from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) that "underscore[s] the need for effective prevention to reduce adolescent use of ... tobacco and marijuana in order to turn back the heroin and opioid epidemic and to reduce burdens of addiction in this country."

One supporter of the ordinance, a professor at UCSF, warned that: "According to data from the Monitoring the Future study, the use of marijuana among teens has reached epidemic proportions. In 2018, a whopping 36% of high school seniors reported using marijuana in the past year. This is a 50% increase from the level in 1991, which was just 24%." He also noted that in 2018, the prevalence of smoking among high school seniors was still 8%, despite decades of anti-smoking campaigns.

According to a spokesperson for the local lung association, "there are numerous flavored marijuana products on the market in San Francisco that are clearly designed to appeal to young people." A review of the menu offered at one San Francisco pot shop -- Urban Pharm on 10th Street in the SOMA district -- revealed a variety of kid-friendly flavors including "super fruit," "jelly roll," "slurricane," "sugar cookies," "sundae driver," "chocolate chip cookies," "orange soda," and "watermelon zkittlez."

The Campaign for Marijuana-Free Kids, in testimony before the Board of Supervisors, asked how supervisors could possibly **not** think that flavors like watermelon Skittles, slurry, chocolate chip cookie, and jelly roll are targeted at youth. "Prohibiting marijuana products in kid-friendly flavors is one of the most important actions we can take to reverse the youth marijuana epidemic and continue reducing youth marijuana use."

The UCSF professor was quoted as stating that: "The FDA is complicit in allowing this epidemic to develop. Other cities and states should follow San Francisco's lead: pass comprehensive flavor bans, followed by legislation to prohibit the sales of cigarettes and marijuana products until they are properly assessed by FDA."

The San Francisco city attorney noted that smoking kills more than 400,000 Americans each year, saying: "Young people have almost indiscriminate access to a product that shouldn't even be on the market. Because the FDA hasn't acted, it's unfortunately falling to states and localities to step into the breach." He also praised the city's supervisors for making San Francisco a national leader in the effort to confront cigarette use, which is the leading cause of preventable death in the nation. "San Francisco has never been afraid to lead. That will always be the case when the health of our children is on the line. I want to thank the Board of Supervisors for taking this pioneering step to protect our youth. This temporary moratorium wouldn't be necessary if the federal government had done its job. Cigarettes are a product that should not be allowed on the market without FDA review. For some reason, the FDA has so far refused to act. If the federal government is not going to act to protect our kids, San Francisco will."

According to the website of the office of the city attorney: "Tobacco use is the leading cause of preventable

disease and death in the United States. Tobacco kills more than 480,000 people a year in this country. That's more than AIDS, alcohol, car accidents, illegal drugs, murders and suicides combined."

Many small businesses in San Francisco, including marijuana dispensaries, convenience stores, and smoke shops complained that if enacted, this law will severely hurt their sales. The owner of "Store 420" on Powell Street couldn't understand why the sale of marijuana had to be completely banned, rather than just restricting it to stores that do not allow minors. "We have strict age verification procedures and I can tell you that we only sell marijuana products to adults. Why does our business have to be sacrificed to protect kids from a product that - while it may be addictive - does not cause any severe acute health effects and it's not even clear that it causes serious long-term health consequences either?"

But the city attorney took issue with the stores' calling this policy a "ban," saying: "This legislation takes a reasoned approach. It doesn't ban cigarettes or marijuana outright. It simply says that a product can't be sold in San Francisco until it receives FDA approval. That's just common sense. If Philip Morris or any company like it wants to sell their product in San Francisco, they should apply to the FDA today for review. If their product really has some kind of psychological benefit to adult smokers, as they claim, rather than a lure to addict another generation, they have the opportunity to get certified before this legislation takes effect."

CORRECTION (June 22, 2019 - 12:55 pm EDT): I have just been informed that I didn't get the story quite correct. Cigarettes and marijuana products are all being allowed to stay on the shelves with no regulation at all, regardless of scientific evidence regarding their serious health hazards, their widespread use among youth, and the targeting of youth by flavors like "slurry" and "jelly roll" that are intended to appeal to youth. Instead, the Board of Supervisors is banning the sale of fake cigarettes (i.e., electronic cigarettes) that contain no tobacco, involve no combustion, and have been demonstrated to be much safer than cigarettes and which also have been used by more than 2.5 million Americans to successfully quit smoking completely. I apologize for this error.

Michael Siegel, MD, MPH
Professor
Department of Community Health Sciences
Boston University School of Public Health
801 Massachusetts Avenue, 4th Floor
Boston, MA 02118
617-358-1347
FAX 617-358-1700

--
To post, send an email to nicotinepolicy@googlegroups.com
More on-line at https://groups.google.com/d/forum/nicotinepolicy including membership, past conversations and user controls
---
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Nicotine Policy" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to nicotinepolicy+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web, visit
https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/nicotinepolicy/BN7PR03MB3700C9448CA190214FAB7165A9E60%40BN7PR03MB3700.namprd03.prod.outlook.com.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: cigarettes
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 1:58:00 PM

From: acidjzaz <acidjzaz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 7:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: cigarettes

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Will you guys and gals be banning cigarettes and alcohol next ?
alcohol 88,000 deaths per year
cigarettes 480,000 deaths per year .

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: e-Cigarette Ban
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:20:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Chad Scott <cscott@chadikins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 3:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: e-Cigarette Ban

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I have never in my life written to the Board of Supervisors nor have I felt compelled to seriously question any action you have taken until now.

I am completely dumbfounded at this vote. I understand you are trying to protect teens from the dangers of nicotine but I have no rationalization on how this will achieve that goal. Teens will simply take BART three stops, buy whatever they need, and come right back or, worse, switch back to traditional cigarettes at a much greater risk to their health.

As a parent, I would much rather be surprised to find my child vaping nicotine than smoking cigarettes. I also find this to be a complete waste of your taxpayer-funded time, especially considering the enormous number of serious troubles our city already faces.

I don’t even consume nicotine in any form and you’ve lost my vote.

Chad Scott
94116

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: E-Cigarettes
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:26:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Selhorst <sarahselhorst@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:36 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: E-Cigarettes

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I see that you have banned vape/e-cigarettes. While I am not proud of it, e-cigarettes have allowed me to abandon tobacco cigarettes, after 10 years of struggling to be free of them. Since switching, I have been tobacco free for two years. San Francisco has the smallest population of children by percentage of any major US city. Adults here are freely permitted to shoot up heroin and smoke marijuana in public.

From one who is attempting to make better life choices (even if they are not pristine), I beg you to reconsider this potentially life-saving measure.

How is it that heroin and marijuana are green-lighted, while this relatively innocuous vice has been targeted? So very confused...

If you are so very concerned for the health of your constituents, perhaps a better focus would be on the needles and feces on our streets?

Thank you for the consideration,

Sarah Selhorst
District 3

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: File number 190312
Date:	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:48:00 PM
Attachments:	JUUL Labs Inc. - Board of Supervisors_File No 190312 - Correspondence for Record 6.18.19_fnl.pdf

---

From: Chris Gruwell <chris@newdealadvisers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 11:06 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: File number 190312

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Please find here attached a letter from JUUL Labs, Inc. in reference to file number 190312, or item 41 on today's full Board of Supervisors' meeting agenda.

Please include this in the legislative file and distribute it to the Supervisors.

Thank you!

Chris Gruwell

M. 415.608.6583

O. 415.418.9693

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: NO on E-Cigarette Ban
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:19:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Heim <markaustinheim@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 4:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mark Austin Heim <markaustinheim@gmail.com>
Subject: NO on E-Cigarette Ban

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been a pack a day smoker since 2002 and up until the start of this year I had failed numerous times at quitting. I've tried patches, gum, cold turkey, therapy and just about everything in between... NOTHING has worked, until I tried an e-cigarette this past January. Since then I went from a pack a day, down to a few a day, down to nothing. The only thing that has worked to help me quit was using a JUUL. Since then, I've felt so much better, spent less money and greatly improved my quality of life.

The recent legislation you passed to ban e-cigs is not only naive, it's absolutely dangerous to many many SF residents that have quit by using e-cigs. You are literally forcing these people that finally beat their addiction to smoke again - shame on you for that.

I understand your concern with children picking it up - but do you realize how difficult is it to purchase these pods from JUUL if you're under 21? Why go after e-cigs and not cigarettes, or fruit flavored alcohol? You can't pick and choose. We just passed a law not even a year ago that banned flavored pods/cigarettes from SF. Why would you not even give that a chance before trying to ban it completely? If a child drinks alcohol should we ban that? If a kid sneaks into an R rated movie should we ban movies? Kids are killing themselves because they are being bullied on Twitter, should we ban that? Where does it end? Are we going to ban anything and everything that kids aren't legally allowed to do under the guise that they might? Get over yourselves.

I assure you that if you go through with this legislation you will FORCE me and many others back onto cigarettes. Why on earth would you want to do something like that?

Shame on you for passing this without asking the people of the city you represent. This is a HUGE step backwards for a city that is supposed to one of the most progressive cities in the country. E-cigs are a smoking cessation products, why not ban patches and gum?

I ask you to please reconsider this dangerous legislation. You will harm many residents that have fought hard to beat the addiction of cigarettes.

Thank you.

Cheers,
Mark Austin Heim
San Francisco Resident

~ Sent via iPhone ~

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Regarding the just passed ban on Juul and e-cigarettes
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:21:00 PM

From: Rick Vaughn <rick.r.vaughn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 3:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Regarding the just passed ban on Juul and e-cigarettes

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I strongly oppose the decision today to ban sales of Juul and other e-cigarette cartridges in San Francisco. I hope you will reconsider this decision quickly. Of all the issues our city has to address this should not even be considered and is no more likely to increase normal cigarette consumption which is significantly more harmful to both the consumer and those around them.

Rick Vaughn
45 Bartlett St, Unit 411
San Francisco, CA 94110

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Thoughts shared about the recent vaping ban
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:19:00 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco Becomes First U.S. City to Pass an E-Cigarette Ban Hacker News.pdf

---

From: Bogdan Vitoc <bog@bogdanvitoc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 4:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Thoughts shared about the recent vaping ban

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon Board of Supervisors,

I want to share with you an online discussion that took place today about the recent ban on vaping put forth by our Board of Supervisors on the site Hacker News. I can affirm to you that the discussion which I am sharing with you comes from a community that collectively holds a strong sense of improving public projects. Many brilliant minds join us in these forums, many, many of them from the tech industry in the Bay Area of California, but other voices chime in too.

I am an employee in the city, and though I now live in Santa Cruz I feel a sense of belonging in the place. That is why I am sharing this with you. I hope you take the time to read through some of these comments.

Here is the link:
https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=20279393#20280205

I've also attached a PDF of the discussion, captured at 6/25/2019 at 4:34pm PST.

Yours,
Bogdan Vitoc

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Vaping resident of 4611 18th
Date:	Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:17:00 PM

From: kyle brown <kyle.blue.brown@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 5:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Vaping resident of 4611 18th

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Your actions banning vaping today are perverse. This will cause many adults to retreat to smoking cigarettes.

I don't care about your children. Please try parenting them instead of using them as pawns to pass NIMBY prohibition. This is an obvious ploy to extract cash from leading vape companies headquartered in SF (Juul).

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Written Comment Item 42 (Leg 190312)
Date:	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:21:00 PM
Attachments:	Item 42 - Arab American Grocers Association Public Comment.pdf

---

From: Arab American Grocers Association (AAGA) <ArabGrocersAssn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 2:38 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>
Subject: Written Comment Item 42 (Leg 190312)

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Item 42, Leg. 190312

To the Board of Supervisors,

We are writing in opposition to the Ordinance 190312 Health Code - Restricting the Sale, Manufacture, and Distribution of Tobacco Products, Including Electronic Cigarettes unless there are substantive amendments and immediate mitigation for affected small businesses. Proposed amendments include exempting compliant brick and mortar retailers, keeping e-cigarette products in a lock-box, improved technology with age-checking technology for each retailer, and a limit in the amount of product that can be purchased at a time. We also ask that the Supervisors request an Economic Impact Report conducted by the Controller's office prior to a final vote in addition to a study on the black market (since the Ban on Flavored Tobacco) and foreseeable ramifications of a similar proposed ban where products are readily available in neighboring cities and online. We have seen a 25% decrease in tobacco license holding businesses since the Flavored Tobacco Ban last year. The formation of a long-term "working group" has been alluded to in order to address the cumulative affect recent laws have had on the corner grocer sector in particular; however, we ask that immediate mitigation measures be taken including:

a. Administer a tobacco retail permit buy-back program: for licensed tobacco retailers who are interested or, who anticipate that they will be forced into closure due to restrictions on their inventory. The buy-back value should be determined with at least a consideration of the following: discretionary cash flow relative to the product inventory; number of years the tobacco license has been held; proximity to localities that will continue to sell e-cigarette and flavored tobacco products; and the density of tobacco retail permits in the district. This may be a limited option for those who are nearing retirement, wish to sell their business, or want to transition their business entirely.

b. Allowing for a pathway for merchants to diversify their inventory and current consumer offerings. For example: Broker with pop-ups and companies that open food booths in gas stations and stores, i.e. Krispy Krunchy Chicken to support flexible retail options;

d. Facilitate fast-tracked permitting as needed (i.e. the CU process for delis);

e. Connect merchants with consultants who can advise on diversifying their stock;

f. Assist merchants in facilitating bulk purchasing via established trade associations, 501c6s, etc.. This allows for merchants to buy their inventory at a much cheaper price and therefore compete for formula retailers.

g. Expand the Healthy Retail SF program to assist most vulnerable corner stores: The current Health Retail SF program assists corner stores in upgrading their storefronts (through SF Shines), transitioning their current consumer offerings to more healthy options through technical assistance and infrastructure support, and assists with long-term business planning. An estimated $70k is spent per store. At minimum, this fund should be expanded to $3.5 million annually to allow for 50 stores per year to participate per year. (The Sugar Tax proposed budget only allocates $150,000)

h. Reassess the Cigarette Litter Abatement Fee and Fund. Direct that a nexus study be conducted to 1) reassess the fee as compared to the sales of combustible tobacco as well as merchant inventories; 2) evaluate how the funds have been used since program's inception relative to the requirements of the legislation. Ensure funds are used for public outreach and education as intended.

i. Expand on technical assistance that can be provided to merchants through SBDC, OSB, and OEWD - i.e. business to business services and development; POS and general tech support.

Thank you.

AAGA Board

From: Eric Brizee
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject: $2.8 Million for police patrols
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:36:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

As a member of the 1100 Block Group of Market Street, a coalition of businesses, residents and community-based organizations working for better health and safety in the mid-Market Corridor, I urge you NOT TO CUT any of the Mayor's proposed $2.8 million of funding for police patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

It is imperative that we retain police presence in the mid-Market corridor; an area of the city littered with heroin needles, plagued by open drug dealing and the crime that comes with it.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Business in the corridor are suffering now. Tech firms in the area are considering leaving the area. Economic security for the area depends on a thriving business community, a vibrant community and safe streets for all.

DO NOT CUT THIS BUDGET. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric Brizee | Facilities & Operations Manager | American Conservatory Theater | The Strand Theater at 1127 Market Street

Theater. Classes. Community.
Learn more at **act-sf.org**
Donate online at **act-sf.org/support**

From: james@stuffsf.com
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: [FWD: Please DO NOT cut 2.8M for increased patrols and foot beats]
Date: Friday, June 21, 2019 9:59:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Please DO NOT cut 2.8M for increased patrols and foot beats
From: <james@stuffsf.com>
Date: Fri, June 21, 2019 9:52 am
To: "Hillary Ronen" <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, "Norman Yee" <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>, "Sandra Fewer" <Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org>, Catherine.stefani@sfgov.org, mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
Cc: "London Breed" <London.Breed@sfgov.org>

Dear Supervisor Ronen, Mandelman, Stefani, Lee Fewer, Yee,

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

Recently I have been threaten while walking my dog being told "get out of the city you Euro faggot", WHY ?

Recently I have been threaten from someone blocking a corner "I'll kill you if I see you again" in my neighborhood on a block I have to walk, WHY ?

I have owned my duplex since 2002 and within the past month for the first time I have contracted to add a gate on the steps since people have been having sex and using needles on the steps numerous times, WHY ?

Often while walking along market street and 9th street I have to work around the throngs of drug dealers continuously selling and all those shooting up (how embarrassing for friends and family and tourists when they visit), WHY ?

When I was walking to the theater the other day someone through food on me, WHY ?

THIS HAS TO STOP, WE NEED MORE PATROLS and BEAT COPS

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

We have been complaining WE NEED MORE BEAT COPS, PLEASE DON'T TAKE AWAY this 2.8M, things are getting worse.

Looking for HELP
Neighborhood resident and business owner, considering leaving and shutting down my business

James Spinello
745 Clementina Street, unit B
San Francisco, CA 94103
james@stuffsf.com
c 415-710-4288

From:	Peter Fortune
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	ABSOLUTELY DO NOT cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:06:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please DO NOT cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Indeed, it boggles my mind that the Board of Supervisors would ever consider cutting funds to establish increased police patrols.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Peter Fortune
3579 Pierce Street, SF

From:	m-co
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Beat Police
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:33:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million slated for increased patrols and foot beats throughout the city. We need these patrols — especially in areas like the Tenderloin, Mid-Market and Haight Streets.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Please do not take money from the police to pay for a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets.

Thank you.

Marco Place
Haight Street
San Francisco

From:	Alice
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Cc:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)
Subject:	Do not cut Police Foot Patrols
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 1:41:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

We need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street and the Mission that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, trash cans on street corners, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Edward & Alice Gillen
Mission Neighborhood
26th St & Bartlett

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Franco Maurice
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	DO NOT CUT POLICE PATROL BUDGET
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:40:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.
To do this will certainly undermine the little progress the SFPD has been trying to achieve lately.

We need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered
with hypodermic needles and where open opioid dealings take place every day.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco.
If they don't feel safe, they won't come back.

San Francisco residents deserve to feel safe as well.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor.

We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thank you,

Maurice Franco, MD
maurice1950@comcast.net
221/219 Mallorca Way,
San Francisco, CA 94123
(40 year SF resident).

From:	J.J.Surbeck
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do NOT cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 12:36:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. **We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.**

J.J. Surbeck

PS. The recent news that a “compromise” had been reached demonstrate in fact that it is not a compromise at all. It remains highway robbery performed by none other than the Bord of Supervisor itself, and that is an absolute shame. How can you stoop so low? Shame on you! Give back ALL the money to the SFDP at once!

From:	Karl Mochel
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:58:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. We had a tire slashed on one car and the catalytic converter stolen on the other. Because the CC cost $3000 to replace we ended up donating the car. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. As a group, the supervisors have historically been concentrating on stupid political issues like soda and things outside of SF. Show us that you have the right priorities and put money and actions to fixing the homelessness and crime issues. I blame you and the mayor for these problems. Any actions at this point to spend money on yourselves or your offices make you look like indolent uncaring progressives whose priority is social justice over the running of the city.

- Karl Mochel
311 Ashton Ave, San Francisco CA 94112

From:	EAK
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget!!!!
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:35:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from an iPhone

From:	Naomi Burkart
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do Not Cut Police Patrol Budget!!!
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:36:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear All:

At a time in our City when I hear stories from old time San Franciscans about their being mugged, harrassed, and even robbed, it would be extremely foolhardy to divert funds from foot patrols to adding yet another legislative aide to your offices. After having spent years as a teacher in the SF schools, I have had to made sacrifices to benefit, my constituents, the students, rather than to make life easier for myself. It would behoove all of you to think of the welfare of all of us, your constituents. Having another legislative aide would be great, but if it is at the expense of cutting the police patrol budget, then I believe that you need to have another "think"!!!

From:	rkdorey
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget!!
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 10:34:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Ronald & Catherine Dorey

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From:	David Troup
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Cc:	Joel Engardio
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget!
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 11:03:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

David Troup

From:	Paul Seljeseth
To:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Subject:	Do NOT cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 11:37:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Norman Yee, district 7:

As a long time district 7 resident one of the great things has been how relatively quiet and safe our neighborhood was. In the last few years though we've seen a marked increase in street crime. The new foot patrol officers I've seen around in the neighborhood have been a welcome sight.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, definitely not more bureaucrats.

Thank you,
Paul W Seljeseth (District 7)

From:	JEFF NIGH
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:06:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Paul Pak
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 9:38:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Paul Pak
Sunset resident

From:	Karen Singer
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	DO NOT CUT POLICE PATROL BUDGET
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:01:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Karen Singer

From:	Wanda Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 4:46:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	William McCarthy
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:04:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

Have you walked down mid Market lately? We need these patrols, especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles, open drug dealing, homeless, robberies, assaults, and murders. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

My wife walked from our home down Market Street to get her hair done at Union Square one sunny Saturday afternoon. When she got to Mid Market Street she was shocked, feared for her safety, and could not believe how bad it was with all the opportunist criminals that frequent that mid market area and the open drug use. She felt as if she was being sized up as she walked through. Needless to say she won't be doing that again.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

Shame on all of you who want to cut the PD budget for your own agenda. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor or any other irrelevant project you think trump's public safety. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats, I demand it as a native San Franciscan and taxpayer, who has lived here my entire life. If the bureaucracy continues you will leave me no choice but to take my family to a safer city, like most of my childhood friends have done already.

Sincerely,

William McCarthy

Forest Knolls Neighborhood

From:	Michael Martin
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 3:16:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thanks,

Michael Martin

From:	Janette Leyden
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:24:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Supervisors,

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

I live in the Inner Sunset.

Sincerely,

Janette Hunt

From:	george aceves
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 10:29:55 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Michel Balea
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:45:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols to keep the residents safe as well as the tourists.

Even if a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor might be seen as a workload relief. At the moment we need safer streets.

Sincerely,

Michel Balea
7th district.

From:	Teri Torgeson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Sunday, June 23, 2019 9:40:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Mame Campbell
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:45:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut ANY money from the police department's budget.

We need MORE patrols on Market Street and in our neighborhoods. Residents and tourists all deserve to feel safe in our beautiful city and that can only happen if there is a reliable police presence. Increased police foot patrols are vitally important for public safety and help to reduce crimes of opportunity including package theft and car break-ins.

Please do not take money from the SFPD! We need safer streets, not more legislative aides.

I am a concerned citizen and life-long resident of San Francisco. And I vote in every single election.

Mariellen Campbell
235 Ashton Avenue
SF 941112

From:	Alberto Alabanza
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Sunday, June 23, 2019 8:12:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Chloe Jager
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:32:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

As someone who lives in an area that has been plagued by theft and home & vehicle break-ins and vandalism, I implore you to leave the police budget patrol intact.

Thank you,
Chloe Jager

From:	Teresa Monkkonen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Sunday, June 23, 2019 8:25:11 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Meredith Serra
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 9:40:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Meredith Serra
Westwood Highlands

From:	Gloria Asaro
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 7:15:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	John or Leslie
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:10:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

From:	Esteban Peralta
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 2:00:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Esteban Peralta
San Francisco, CA
c: 415-735-4961

From:	Michael Bereskin
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Joel Engardio
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:23:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Michael Bereskin
101 Encline Court
San Francisco CA 94127-1837

From:	Joseph Croughwell, III
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 12:52:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Best regards,

J-
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Peter Yorke
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:20:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Peter Yorke
2201 Pacific Ave
San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	Natalie A Federico
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 11:51:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Natalie Federico

From:	Fix Shotwell
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:19:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. And Shotwell/Capp, where the City allows an open-air sex traffic market to exist every night of the week.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Andrew Oglesby

From:	Donna Brown
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 10:43:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Rick Giordano
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 9:05:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	susan Tome
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Saturday, June 22, 2019 5:00:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Rose W.
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:52:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Virus-free. www.avg.com

From:	Irma Miranda
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:06:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Ruth Rosen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:06:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We want our tax dollars to help provide safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Ruth Rosen

Sent from my iPhone

From:	james reece
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 4:56:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Dave Clark
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 3:30:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Gail O"Connor
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 2:50:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	shegoleff@att.net
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 2:24:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols ??? especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my LG G8 ThinQ, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From:	Nathan Lemkhin
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 1:28:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

This is very upsetting! I see more dangerous and crazy people on the street than before and feel less safe, although my neighborhood is far from the worst.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Do take this seriously. If you think this is fear mongering, you are out of touch and full of hubris. This is our city, and you are servants of the people.

Sincerely,

Nathan Lemkhin, concerned citizen

From:	lismaxima
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 12:53:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. Please also do not shut down juvenile hall.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Plus, there is also a great deal of juvenile robbery cases that come from that area

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Best Regards,

Lisa Dean

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

From:	Alaska - Sagway train
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 12:45:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Alaska - Sagway train
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject: do not cut police patrol budget
Date: Friday, June 21, 2019 12:44:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Denise Chu
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 11:09:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent by mobile

From:	Ronald W Mayer
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 10:25:41 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Ronald W Mayer , PhD
Professor Emeritus of Psychology, SFSU
30 Lopez Avenue, SF, 94116

From:	Sherri Chiesa
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 10:13:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sherri Chiesa
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Franklin Sanchez
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:47:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Franklin Sanchez, MD

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Bronwyn Gundogdu
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:26:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Joan Lynch
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:13:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Born and raised in this once beautiful city. It is now embarrassing. It would be wonderful to see that elected officials cared as much about the hard-working everyday citizen as they do about, I don't know what, the filth that is plaguing this town? Nope, don't care much about that either.
Please have the courage to do the right thing.
66 years living here and what a mess this city has become. Breaks my heart.
Joan Lynch

See below.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Frank Billante
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:44:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From: David Singer
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Haneystaff (BOS)
Subject: do not cut police patrol budget
Date: Friday, June 21, 2019 8:16:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mr Haney

Dear Mr Haney:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols. They have made the greatest improvement in our neighborhood we have ever seen (though the street cleaning also deserves a mention), and are essential to continued improvement in district 6.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

David Singer

singer@mac.com

From:	Olga Martin
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:10:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	sandie Yu
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 8:06:02 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sandie Yu
(Cell) 415-706-9165

Sent from my iPhone

From:	EVERETT SNOWDEN
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:49:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Mary Connolly
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:46:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Luis Perez-Cordero
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:32:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco.

If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor.

We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Luis Perez-Cordero – Ford Street, San Francisco, CA 94114

Virus-free. www.avast.com

From:	Margaret McKelvie
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:29:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Tina McGovern
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:26:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Your priorities are not in the right place. With what I experience on city streets and muni in this town this is wrong

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Jacki AOL
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:26:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Margaret McKelvie
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:23:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Sarah Bircher
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:15:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

I disagreed that police should be able to use private video systems as a surveillance tool

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Peter Wansch
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:01:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

We also need a safer Bart and Muni system. I've witnessed a knife attack and drug use involving needles or other things that made me feel unsafe during the last few months.

Peter Wansch

From:	Jeanne Dorward
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:59:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Brian Veazey
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:57:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

I'm tired of not feeling safe on BART and Muni. In the last month alone I've seen a man pull a knife on a fellow passenger, homeless people smoke crack IN a BART car, and countless homeless and insane people scream obscenities, relieve themselves, and act aggressively toward others around stations. As someone who pays FAR MORE than my fair share of taxes I demand you address these issues and you can start by INCREASING foot police patrols.

Brian Veazey
Westwood Highlands

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Agnes Davis
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:47:11 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Lou Short
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:42:23 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Carol Enright
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 6:28:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Carol Wicklund Enright

West Portal resident for over 30 years

From:	Sue
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 5:42:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sue Wong

From:	Lisa Chmelewski
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 12:51:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Lisa Chmelewski
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 12:51:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	clicko
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 11:28:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Sue or Cathy Scheiter
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 10:29:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Susana Scheiter

From:	Karina Gertsikova
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 10:10:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Linda Hee
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 10:01:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Kristy Heim
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:34:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	James Lubs
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:14:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	yvettedubsf
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:25:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
SF Native

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	RADHA LORCA
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:12:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thanks
Radha Lorca
Sent from my iPhone

From:	MeMe
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Brown, Vallie (BOS)
Cc:	MayorLondonBreed.Mayor"sOffice@sf.gov
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:49:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. We also need repaired streets on which the working citizens and tax-payers of thisCity need to make it the luring place for tourists. We also need police around to eradicate the entitled idea that bicycles and skate boards and skaters can use the sidewalks for their private roadway. We also need some consideration for the older people who have built the neighborhoods and have paid taxes or have made rented housing appropriate for people who don';t own homes in San Francisco.

It seems to many of us that undue consideration for the young, the millenials, the privileged who have jobs whose job descriptions defy definition, the leisured class of homeless and partially employed, and the developers and Uber drivers is distracting the powers that be from the broader picture of maintaining and developing city life that allows all sorts of people and businesses to co-exist in the interest of the whole.

So please, get back to providing the leadership of running the City rather than just attending to restricted neighborhood goals and Manhattanizing San Francisco any further.

Respectfully yours,

MeMe Riordan

From:	Stefanie S
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:09:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Stefanie Schneider
2 Allston Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	Valentina Prutkina
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:07:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	mike singer
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:02:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Mike Singer
3154 Baker St.
SF Ca 94123

From:	Linda Ly
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:59:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Bonnie George
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:28:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Bonnie George
District 7

From:	Wincy Wong
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:00:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	TsungYun Hsu
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:32:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Tsung-yun Hsu
District 7 resident

From:	Tak Hou Fong
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 4:51:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Tak Hou Fong
San Francisco sunset resident

From:	Tak Hou Fong
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 4:50:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
San Francisco sunset resident

From:	Bernard Roazen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 4:26:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	kathy morello
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 4:12:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Melanie Scardina
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 2:59:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Sharone Franzen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 2:52:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. **We are suffering way too many car break-ins!**

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Best,
Sharone Franzen
Licensed Acupuncturist & Herbalist
2636 Ocean Ave SF CA 94132
www.bluewillowacu.com
(415) 572 - 1797

From:	linda@kembytv.com
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 10:28:02 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols â€" especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	David Steil
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:53:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Jorge Garcia
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:37:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	david zellhart
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:29:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Lisa Corry
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:54:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Lisa Corry

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Diana Hidalgo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:48:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

As a third generation San Franciscan and a victim of crime, I employ you to always make public safety your first priority.

Sincerely,
Diana Hidalgo
Sunset District

From:	jimmy
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:20:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime
SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols %2►► especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco.
If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay
for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	Al H
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:00:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

San Francisco is a crime ridden city and the criminals come here just to commit crimes because now the Supervisors want to cut police patrols too! this added to the ridiculous standards of tying the hands of the police from doing an effective job is going too far! The Supervisors are making San Francisco into a crime free zone for criminals and that is criminal. How is the honest law abiding citizens suppose to fend for themselves now that you unleashed pandora’s box? cut other special interest political budgets instead of cutting up the SFPD.

Sincerely,

Al Hampel

Sent from my iPad

From:	Grace yahoo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:00:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thanks
Grace Monares

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Marina Roche
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:38:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Maureen Kirwan
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:57:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Do the right thing. Keep the money where it is needed the most. Keep the money on the streets! The last thing this city needs is one more bureaucrat! Best Regards, The Salarypaying Taxpayer

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Jul
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 10:55:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Julie Fitzgerald
Certified signing agent
415-297-5972

From:	julie fitzgerald
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 10:54:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Aaron Pramana
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 10:37:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Aaron Pramana

From:	John Votruba
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 10:09:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime
SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols %2►► especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco.
If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay
for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	charnaball
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Stop Crime SF
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 9:33:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	CHARNA BALL
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Stop Crime SF
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 9:32:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Charna ball

From:	Raphaelle Curien-Lenzo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:39:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Regards,

"Disclaimer: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from disclosing, distributing, copying, or in any way using this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and destroy and delete any copies you may have received."

From:	Raphaelle Curien-Lenzo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:39:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Best regards,
Raphaelle Curien-Lenzo
845-589-9904

From:	Geoff Wood
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:28:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Big mistake - Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. They already are complaining about hassles from homeless and the trash and human feces on our lovely streets.
Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. A full complement of police, then we can talk about more staff.

Geoff Wood
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Jasmine Patel
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:15:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

Best,
Jasmine Patel

From:	Ann-Marie Walsh La Rocca
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:05:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Chris Hardy
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:50:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Susan Horst
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:46:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Susan Horst
Attorney at Law
law.susanhorst@gmail.com
601 Van Ness Ave., #651
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 346-5138

CONFIDENTIALITY - This e-mail message and any attachments thereto are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and contains a private, confidential communication protected by the attorney client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

From:	Diane Valente
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:29:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Diane M Valente

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Susan Fisch
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:03:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Susan Fisch
sfisch116@comcast.net
415-377-0309

From:	tomasbarry@aol.com
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 6:44:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	armand der-hacobian
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 5:53:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Get Outlook for iOS

From:	Roger Capilos
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 5:42:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: we saw a police officer at Mission/ Geneva on a bicycle and we almost ran over to hug him. Of course you could always spend the police dollars on shrinks for junkies or just toss the money into the bay. Please help actual San Franciscans for ONCE. Roger Capilos 318 Allison St. SF Ca.94112

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Don Mariacher
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 5:27:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Don Mariacher
1200 Gough Street, #6C

From:	Tom O"Connor
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:57:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Carmel Passanisi
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:54:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	doug lenzo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:51:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I have recently noticed and uptick in foot patrol and have felt safer because of their presence! It has been amazing to physically notice police when before not one could be found. And hearing the squad's sirens makes me feel like something is being done on our streets!

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thank you,

Doug

Sent from my iPhone

From:	otomillo@gmail.com
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:50:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Oleg

From:	Sheri Richmond
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:46:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Wallace Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:14:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Wallace Lee

From:	Arnold Cohn
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:12:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Arnold Cohn

From:	nikintl@aol.com
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:02:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	C. Worcester
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:35:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

**Note: I am using the form letter that Stop Crime San Francisco has provided due to a very busy work and home schedule. Please be aware that I feel very strongly about the contents of this email.*
Thank you.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

~Charlotte Worcester
Glen Park resident since 1989

From:	David Greenthal
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:29:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Joann Burke
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:25:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Joann Burke
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:24:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	royalmargie@aol.com
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:24:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	nd
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:13:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Carol Dimmick, district 7, 25-year resident, member of GWPNA and concerned/involved citizen

From:	Alyssa Jennings
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:04:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Chris Newgard
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:55:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Chris Newgard
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:54:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Steven Madrid
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:46:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Art Wydler
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:41:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Art Wydler
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:41:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	A Anderson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:40:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Adrienne
Anderson
3415-22St #27
sf,ca, 94110

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Karen Wood
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:29:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

Is it true that you are reallocating funds from the SFPD to fund a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. Do you seriously think that your constituents would approve of moving funds from the SFPD? Does the SFPD currently meet the Charter mandate for minimum SFPD staffing? I urge you to increase, rather than decrease, SFPD funding.

Yours truly,

Karen Wood
Miraloma Park
District 7

From:	Lourdes P
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:26:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Lourdes P
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:25:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Mark Rosenthal
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:23:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Mark Rosenthal

From:	Cxavier623
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:18:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

The police budget needs to be ramped up, not decreased!

Dr. Christopher Xavier

Sent from my iPhone

From:	ALICE XAVER
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:09:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats!

We need more money to support public safety!

Alice Xavier
District 7

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any typos

From:	Matthew O"Hara
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:53:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Matthew O’Hara
+1.415.254.3827
matthew.ohara@gmail.com

From:	Steven Pregulman
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:52:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Ms Stefani: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats
throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols %2►► especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion
that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should
not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	Dick Allen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:48:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

From:	Irene Kaus
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:46:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

You DON ‘T need another aide. In fact, you dint need three!!!

We NEED MORE POLICE OFFICERS TO PATROL OUR STREETS!

Irene Kaus
415-922-225
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Elizabeth
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:35:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Elizabeth Hosfield
1732 Baker Street
San Francisco, Ca 94115

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Nancy Panelo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:26:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Kyle P. Johnson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:23:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Regards,

Kyle Johnson

From:	Amy Johnson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:17:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

I do not support supervisors having a fourth legislative aid (and other budget diversions) at the expense of the safety of hard working SF residents like myself and my neighbors.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Amy Johnson
Homeowner, District 7

Sent from my iPhone

From:	William Spina
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:15:45 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sincerely,
William Spina MD

From:	audrey yi
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Sunday, June 30, 2019 8:11:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	JeNeal Granieri
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	do not cut police patrol budget—We need protection
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:19:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please think of the people you represent.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Jason Conn
To:	MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	DO NOT CUT POLICE PATROLS
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 5:09:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Mandelman, et. al,

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

That this is even being considered, with the current state of bad street behavior and property crime, is absolutely baffling.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Jason Conn
District 8 Resident

From:	T Stephen Henderson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Do not cut SFPD patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:42:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely yours,
T. S. Henderson

From:	Bill Kedem
To:	MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); jcurran@sfmediaco.com; acooper@sfchronicle.com; matierandross@sfchronicle.com
Subject:	Do Not Cut the Police Budget; Cut Budget for Bureaucrats & Inefficient - High Spending Public Defenders Office
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:14:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor and Supervisors:

I am appalled at the ongoing increases City-County budget that in no way correspond to the increase in our population, nor to other U.S. and global cities our size, with consolidated city - county governance! The current increase to $12B+ is unacceptable in principle.

Our property crime is still at the highest levels in the entire U.S. Why do certain current Supervisors insist on adding more expensive bureaucracy while cutting our Police Dept. budget?

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

On another budget cutting subject, after just serving jury duty at 850 Bryant St., I am also amazed at the huge amount of funds (probably millions of dollars per year) that are wasted by the PD's (Public Defenders) Office. For example, the currently in process People vs. "Willie Flanagan" case is a prime candidate for a "No Contest" plea. Just on this current case, **the PD's Office is wasting $100,000+ by allowing this previously convicted criminal (with many eye witnesses to his latest - horrible crimes) to tie up jurors' lives and the court system - by proceeding to trial on a "Not Guilty" plea. And during the jury selection process, the PD's Office consistently took considerable more time than the Prosecutor's Office to question each potential juror.**

Many (fortunately not all) of our Supervisors, and our Mayor are will be held fully accountable in the media and future elections - for your wasteful, inappropriate spending, AND lack of practical oversight of the operations such as the PDs Office. And all of this irresponsible governance occurs as our property crime rate is absurdly high and creating so much hardship upon victims of our local property crimes. Shame on our Mayor and our Board's handful of irresponsible members!

Sincerely,

Bill Kennedy Kedem
Pacific Heights

From: mike singer
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Don not cut police budget
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:03:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Mike Singer
3154 Baker St.
SF Ca 94123

From:	Kennethtrr
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Don't Cut Police Budget!
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:59:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Whoever voted to increase their salary on the board of Sups will NOT be getting my vote, you should all be ashamed. You don't need the money, the struggling city workers do. You're despicable.

- Kevin
Haight-Ashbury

From:	Steven Aiosa
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t Cut Police Patrols!
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 1:00:55 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Steven Aiosa
Sunset District

From:	Hugues
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; illary.Ronen@sfgov.org
Subject:	Don"t cut police patrols
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 10:50:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I have seen first hand the positive effects of the increased foot beats in my neighborhood. While there's still a long way to go to make our neighborhood safe and clean, cutting down on police patrols is precisely the one thing that will hurt recent improvements.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Hugues HARDEL
SOMA

From:	Fiona O"Shea
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Fwd: Please do not cut SFPD foot patrols in D6 in budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 1:10:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

For the records
---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Fiona O'Shea** <foshea@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jun 20, 2019 at 1:09 PM
Subject: Please do not cut SFPD foot patrols in D6 in budget
To: <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>, <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>, <MandlemanStaff@sfgov.org>, <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Haneystaff (BOS) <haneystaff@sfgov.org>

Dear Supervisors
The foot patrols in our neighborhood are very helpful to neighbors, business owners and to our long time homeless neighbors. They know our streets and alleys. They are accessible to us.

We live close to Civic Center and we are inundated with open air drug dealing and IV Drug Users. We have multiple OD's per day which are reversed by on site Police officers with Narcan.

From a neighborhood perspective, I do believe Foot patrols work to keep our neighborhood a little bit safer while we work with them and our Supervisor to clean up the dealing, addiction and related crimes in our neighborhood.

I'm attaching a photo I took this morning while waiting for the bus with my kids. Dealers pointed out in yellow. This is a daily scene.

Please don't take away money that facilitates the few resources we have.

thank you for your consideration
Fiona O'Shea
Western SoMa D6

From:	Margaret GoAsk
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	KEEP Funding for Police Foot Beats
Date:	Monday, June 24, 2019 4:11:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

I live in the Bayview and work at the foot of Market Street, so I see a LOT of situations and incidents that ONLY foot patrols can resolve - the simple presence of uniformed officers encourages workers and residents to reach out, and discourages some of the worst offenses. Having officers regularly working foot beats allows them to become familiar with the people and hazards, builds trust between them and even the mentally ill street people, and puts them in a far safer position than being called out on a 911 run when they don't know the terrain.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. I constantly hear foreigners and out of towners remarking on the dirt, crazies, and general ugliness and unsafe nature of our downtown. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Cutting funding for foot beats goes in exactly the wrong direction.

And as for adding a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor - REALLY? We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.Let the existing legislative aides work smarter, like the rest of the population does.

The Board of Supervisors is already regarded very poorly by most longer term residents of San Francisco. Please do not prove your detractors right yet one more time.

From:	Christopher Faust
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Keep the money in the budget for foot patrols
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 2:44:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am asking you to please reconsider cuts to the police department's budget. The $2.8M slated for increased patrols and foot beats throughout the city are vital to our public safety. We need these patrols. In addition to building community relationships and putting eyes and ears on the street, foot patrols send a visual message that San Francisco is serious about protecting the public and protecting our image.

Our local economy depends tourism. When residents communicate that they do not feel safe and the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities, that message travels far and wide. We need to fight back and make it clear that public safety is a priority.

Please reconsider the budget and find other areas to make cuts. We need safer streets now. Keep foot patrols in the budget.

Sincerely,

Christopher Faust
235 30th Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
415 205-5855

From: Lyna Joyce
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Neighborhood Police Patrol
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:06:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.
We need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.
Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.
Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.
You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Ken and Lyna Joyce
Glen Park Neighborhood
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Debbie Evans
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please - Do Not Cut Police Patrol Budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 11:10:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Debbie Evans
Visitacion Valley Resident
sent from mobile device

From:	will@stuffsf.com
To:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); hilary.ronen@sfgov.org; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	PLEASE DO NOT CUT 2.8 from Police budget - we need MORE PATROLS and BEAT COPS
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:57:50 AM
Attachments:	sigimg1

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

PLEASE DO NOT CUT 2.8M from Patrols and beat cops

Will
STUFF
150 Valencia Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
c 415-710-5352

From:	Kevin Mangan
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please do not cut police patrol budget - thank you!
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:28:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

Please reconsider taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We really urgently need safer streets - thank you!

From:	Corinna Low
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:50:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor,

First of all, I thank you for all the hard work you do for us. You have a challenging job and I am appreciative of your efforts! Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

Corinnna Low,
a middle school science teacher who resides in SF

From:	Chad Seeger
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 3:04:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

-Chad

From:	Steve Snyder
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please DO NOT cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 9:23:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

With respect,

Steve Snyder
445 Darien Way
San Francisco, CA 94127

--
Steve Snyder
stevesny@gmail.com
https://clearweb.io/
https://www.stevesnyderdesign.com/
https://www.linkedin.com/in/stevesnyderprofile/

From:	Raymond Fabrizio
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Please Do Not Cut San Francisco Police Foot Patrols
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:52:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear supervisor(s):

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. We need these patrols — our city has become a haven for criminals. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks number one in property crime. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thank you.

Raymond

From:	Joel D
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please DO NOT cut the patrol budget
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 2:40:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

We need to maintain the the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Thanks,

- Joel Dujsik
tel: 408-218-8843.

From:	Drew James
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	Please do not cut the police department"s budget!!
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 5:05:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor: Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. We need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.
Sincerely,
Drew and Celeste James
475 Mangels Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127 Sunnyside Neighborhood

From:	Jennifer Benz
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	Please don"t cut police foot patrols
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 4:41:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors and Budget Committee,

I'm very concerned about recent reports of potential budget cuts to police patrols.

I live in Potrero Hill and work in SOMA (at 9th & Folsom). Both my apartment and my office have been broken into in the last couple years and I'm very alarmed by the growing property crime in SF.

In Potrero, breakins are happening in broad daylight and many neighbors, including myself, have felt the need to install robust security systems and cameras. This is so disheartening when the neighborhood used to feel safe enough to leave your doors unlocked.

In SOMA, I frequently see open drug use and disturbing behavior and I advise my team to be on high alert at all times, day and night. Despite cautions, a young woman on my team was injured while being mugged at 7th & Howard.

I'm sure you share a desire to create a city that is welcoming and safe for everyone. At this moment in time, a larger police presence in key areas would help return some of feeling of personal security and safety that has eroded in recent years.

Thank you,

Jennifer Benz
415-806-3005

From:	Sally Hatchett
To:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Please don"t cut police patrols
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 7:04:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am dismayed by the rising crime in San Francisco. Everyday someone tells me their car was broken into, or their house was broken into. And then they tell me how hard it is to report to the police and how most often they just don't report it -- even when wallets are stolen. The number of cars broken into in my neighborhood (West Portal) is so high and persistent, that I am reluctant to have visitors. That is sad and disheartening. It makes me feel badly to live here.

Just in the last couple of days, as it got later into the night, I had to ask a man who had spent several hours drinking and talking loudly to himself in my front yard to please move on. And I saw another man injecting drugs on West Portal Avenue during the business day.

So please, please do not cut police patrols.

Please help make the streets safer. This situation is dire and really frightening and embarrassing for the City of San Francisco.

The recent WAPO article left us off light -- almost glossing over the crime problem.

We are an easy target for criminals -- and the easier we make it for them, the more we will have.

Thank you,
Sally Hatchett

2715 14th Avenue

From:	Matt Chamberlain
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please increase police patrol budget - DO NOT cut funding for police foot patrols
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 7:57:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

I'm a voter in District 7, and a long time officer in our local neighborhood association. I and my neighbors do pay attention to the City Budget, and the actions of our supervisors.

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Matt Chamberlain
West Portal, San Francisco

From:	Blanche Korfmacher
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	YeeStaff, (BOS)
Subject:	Police Dept. Budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 2:05:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Lee:

Do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing, as well as in the Sunset District and other neighborhoods where home and vehicle break ins and package thefts are rampant.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Blanche Korfmacher
District 7

CONTACT THE SUPERVISORS
Always send your email to Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org so your message is put in the official record.

From:	MIcky Powell
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject:	police patrol budget - don"t cut it!
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 11:41:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

San Franciscans are no longer feeling safe. I've heard that you are intending to cut police patrols on our streets. For Heaven's sake, WHY? Not a good idea. Crime is skyrocketing here. We need more, not less police on foot patrol. Please do not cut the police budget. Give the police the money and the power they need to clean up our streets. Public safety has to be high priority.

Thank you,
Maxine Powell
San Francisco native

From: Susanna Singer
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Haneystaff (BOS)
Subject: Police Patrol Budget cuts
Date: Friday, June 21, 2019 11:25:14 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Haney:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols. They have made the greatest improvement in our neighborhood we have ever seen (though the street cleaning also deserves a mention), and are essential to continued improvement in district 6. For example, the two beat officers who regularly walk our residential block of Tehama Street have made a notable difference in the number of people using drugs on the street over the past six months, and over the past year car break-ins have decreased dramatically – there is a visible improvement when there is visible police presence on the streets.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too – including homeless residents (especially the elderly) who are often preyed upon by the drug dealers and users that police presence discourages.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

I appreciate what I have seen of your careful attention to the pressing issues in District 6, and I believe that this is an area where your opposition to this proposed budget cut will really make a difference.

Sincerely,

Susanna Singer.

From:	Kim M
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary
Subject:	police patrol cuts
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:04:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors: We have heard you plan to cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city. We need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street area and parts of the Mission that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing. Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too. Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities. You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. Why is this is even a debate ? Sincerely,
Kim Marcellini and Sean McKenna
Bernal Heights

From:	dawn isaacs
To:	MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Police patrols
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:28:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Supervisors,

I'm not sure if this is accurate, but I received an email on NextDoor today re The City plans to cut police patrols.

We need more police patrols, not less.
-Cars race through stops signs in Glen Park.
-Car break-ins and thefts are constant.
-Friends are now afraid to take BART or walk the short walk from Powel Street Part to the theater.

The truth is, I rarely see police officers.
Please do what you can to keep the public safe.

Sincerely,

Dawn Isaacs - Glen Park Resdent
2600 Diamond St
SF 94131

From:	Diana Hidalgo
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Prioritize Public Safety
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:47:25 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

As a third generation San Franciscan and a victim of crime, I employ you to always make public safety your first priority.

Sincerely,
Diana Hidalgo
Sunset District

From:	Geoff Wood
To:	Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc:	Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Subject:	Re: do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 11:32:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Yee,

Residents of the City are all surprised by your response to our request to fund a full (previously approved) complement police force in San Francisco so that they can increase foot patrols and do their job properly.
Maybe you don't get out much walking the streets of the city, but our city is filthy!! It is overrun with homeless encampments! Street crime is out of control in too many neighborhoods!

How about YOU doing something about this instead of talking out of your ear? You no doubt have your full staff complement - the police force doesn't. So let's priortize what's important. The people who live here want a safe, clean city. I imagine the tourists that continue to show up every year want the same thing. They support your pay and that of your staff, last time I checked.

Thank you,
Geoff Wood

On Wed, Jun 19, 2019 at 8:28 PM Geoff Wood <ggwood2@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Supervisor:
>
> Big mistake - Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols and foot beats throughout the city.
>
> I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols.
>
> Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. They already are complaining about hassles from homeless and the trash and human feces on our lovely streets.
> Residents deserve to feel safe, too.
>
> Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.
>
> We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. A full complement of police, then we can talk about more staff.
>
> Geoff Wood
> Sent from my iPhone

From:	Yee, Norman (BOS)
To:	Geoff Wood; Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc:	Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]
Subject:	RE: do not cut police patrol budget
Date:	Friday, June 21, 2019 1:47:44 PM

Geoff – Here are the facts: this year's SFPD budget is being increased by $62 million dollars, an additional $20 million dollars is allotted for overtime, more than 150 new staff are also being added.

I also spearheaded the civilianization analysis of the SFPD's personnel so that we could move police officers off of desk, administrative, clerical jobs and back to doing the jobs that these officers originally got hired to do – almost 100 positions are in the process of being civilianized so that SFPD will have additional sworn personnel back policing as a result. This not only saves the city money in the long-term, it gets more officers back into active duty.

I take public safety seriously. I also take my duty seriously to make sure that we are allocating public dollars in a way that benefits our residents, workers, businesses, and visitors to most impact here.

In the future, please feel free to contact our office and we'll get you actual facts vs. supposition. We may still disagree but life is stressful enough without adding unnecessary stressors based on not having the most accurate information to anyone's life. The fact that you took the time to email me tells me that you are concerned about this and hopefully this information helps alleviate some of your concern.

Norman

From: Geoff Wood <ggwood2@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2019 11:33 AM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>
Cc: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: do not cut police patrol budget

> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Yee,

Residents of the City are all surprised by your response to our request to fund a full (previously approved) complement police force in San Francisco so that they can increase foot patrols and do their job properly.
Maybe you don't get out much walking the streets of the city, but our city is filthy!! It is overrun

with homeless encampments! Street crime is out of control in too many neighborhoods!

How about YOU doing something about this instead of talking out of your ear? You no doubt have your full staff complement - the police force doesn't. So let's priortize what's important. The people who live here want a safe, clean city. I imagine the tourists that continue to show up every year want the same thing. They support your pay and that of your staff, last time I checked.

Thank you,
Geoff Wood

On Wed, Jun 19, 2019 at 8:28 PM Geoff Wood <ggwood2@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Supervisor:
>
> Big mistake - Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols and foot beats throughout the city.
>
> I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols.
>
> Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. They already are complaining about hassles from homeless and the trash and human feces on our lovely streets.
> Residents deserve to feel safe, too.
>
> Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.
>
> We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats. A full complement of police, then we can talk about more staff.
>
> Geoff Wood
> Sent from my iPhone

From:	Nina Moore
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Support street police patrols
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:58:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,
Nina Moore
Golden Gate Heights
Sent from my iPhone

From:	jshera@att.net
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject:	we need these patrols
Date:	Thursday, June 20, 2019 7:02:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor:

Please do not cut the $2.8 million in the police department's budget slated for increased patrols on Market Street and foot beats throughout the city.

I agree with Stop Crime SF and its more than 500 members that we need these patrols — especially in areas like Market Street that are littered with heroin needles and have open drug dealing.

Our local economy depends on the $10 billion that tourists spend annually in San Francisco. If they don't feel safe, they won't come back. Residents deserve to feel safe, too.

Public safety should be a priority when the FBI says San Francisco ranks #1 in property crime among large U.S. cities.

You should not be taking money from the police to pay for things like a fourth legislative aide for each supervisor. We need safer streets, not more bureaucrats.

Sincerely,

J. Chesler
Inner Sunset

From: Donovan, Dominica (ECN)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc: Dick-Endrizzi, Regina (ECN); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Supervisors
Subject: SBC Resolution - Economic Mitigation Measures for City Small Businesses
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 11:00:40 AM
Attachments: SBC RESO 2019-002- Economic Mitigation Measures.pdf
Ltr to Clerk - SBC RESO 2019-002- Economic Mitigation Measures.pdf

---

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On June 24, 2019 the Small Business Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider submitting a resolution to the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Mayor requesting that economic mitigation measures be administered in support of San Francisco small business retailers who are licensed to sell tobacco products. This is responsive to City administered bans on the sales of certain tobacco products. The City bans referenced were authorized under Board of Supervisors File Nos. 170441 Health Code – Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products, and soon to be authorized 190312 Health Code – Restricting the Sale, Manufacture, and Distribution of Tobacco Products.

The Commission felt a particular urgency to submit this resolution in light of the Office of Economic Analysis's (OEA) June 2017 report which found that a ban on the sales of flavored tobacco, which became operative in January of this year, would result in a loss in product value of $50 million per year. Although the OEA did not conduct an economic impact report on BOS File No. 190312, the Commission has estimated, based on the data provided in June 2017 report, that the ban on the sales of e-cigarette products may result in a loss of $70 million per year in product value. Combined, the City's ~700 licensed tobacco retailers who are also often our corner stores and small grocers, may see a total loss of $120 million per year in product value.

Please find the attached documents relating to the action of the Commission. If you have any questions or require further information please let me know.

Many thanks,

Dominica Donovan
Senior Policy Analyst
Small Business Commission Secretary

Office of Small Business
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 110
Direct: (415) 554-6489 | Office: (415) 554-6134

website | business portal | facebook | twitter

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

June 25, 2019

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisors: Fewer, Stefani,
Peskin, Mar, Brown, Haney, Yee,
Mandelman, Ronen, Walton, and Safai
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Transmittal of Small Business Commission Resolution Number: SBC RESO 2019 – 002: Economic Mitigation Measures Responsive to City Bans on the Sales of Certain Tobacco Products

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors,

On June 24, 2019 the Small Business Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider submitting a resolution to the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Mayor requesting that economic mitigation measures be administered in support of San Francisco small business retailers who are licensed to sell tobacco products. This is responsive to City administered bans on the sales of certain tobacco products. The City bans referenced were authorized under Board of Supervisors File Nos. 170441 Health Code – Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products, and soon to be authorized 190312 Health Code – Restricting the Sale, Manufacture, and Distribution of Tobacco Products.

The Commission felt a particular urgency to submit this resolution in light of the Office of Economic Analysis's (OEA) June 2017 report which found that a ban on the sales of flavored tobacco, which became operative in January of this year, would result in a loss in product value of $50 million per year. Although the OEA did not conduct an economic impact report on BOS File No. 190312, the Commission has estimated, based on the data provided in June 2017 report, that the ban on the sales of e-cigarette products may result in a loss of $70 million per year in product value. Combined, the City's ~700 licensed tobacco retailers who are also often our corner stores and small grocers, may see a total loss of $120 million per year in product value.

Please find the attached documents relating to the action of the Commission. If you have any questions or require further information please let me know.

Sincerely,

Regina Dick-Endrizzi, Director, Office of Small Business

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 110, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
T: 415.554.6134 F: 415.558.7844 E: SBC@SFGOV.ORG W: WWW.SFOSB.ORG

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LONDON N. BREED, MAYOR

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS
SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
REGINA DICK-ENDRIZZI, DIRECTOR

STEPHEN ADAMS, PRESIDENT
MARK DWIGHT, VICE PRESIDENT
KATHLEEN DOOLEY, COMMISSIONER
SHARKY LAGUANA, COMMISSIONER
WILLIAM ORTIZ-CARTAGENA, COMMISSIONER
IRENE YEE RILEY, COMMISSIONER
MIRIAM ZOUZOUNIS, COMMISSIONER

June 24, 2019

Resolution No. 002-2019-SBC

Economic Mitigation Measures Responsive to City Bans on the Sales of Certain Tobacco Products

Resolution

WHEREAS, the Small Business Commission, whose mandate was established by the voters in 2003; and

WHEREAS, that mandate specifically authorizes the Small Business Commission to set policies for the City regarding small businesses, consistent with any overall objectives established by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors through the adoption of legislation, in order to promote the economic health of the small business community in San Francisco, its employees, and its customers; and

WHEREAS, that mandate specifically requires the Small Business Commission to review all legislation affecting small businesses and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, that mandate specifically requires that the Small Business Commission review rules and regulations adopted by City departments that affect small businesses and recommend modifications that would promote the health of small businesses; and

WHEREAS, there are approximately 700 small businesses that are City licensed tobacco retailers; and

WHEREAS, since implementation of the San Francisco Permit Density Cap, the total number of tobacco retail permits has declined by 23%; and

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 110, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
(415) 554-6134 / www.sfosb.org / sbc@sfgov.org

WHEREAS, on September 5, 2017 the City and County of San Francisco enacted BOS File No. 170441 Health Code - Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Economic Analysis issued an economic impact report on June 13, 2017 relative to File No. 170441 and estimated that there could be a $50 million dollar loss in the sales per year of flavored tobacco products;

WHEREAS, the Small Business Commission passed a motion on September 24, 2018 recommending that the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and Department of Public Health develop economic mitigation measures for licensed tobacco retailers who would be affected by the flavored tobacco ban;

WHEREAS, the ban on the sales of flavored tobacco products by City licensed retailers has had a direct adverse effect on the economic health of the City licensed tobacco retailers

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors first passed on June 18, 2019 BOS File Nos. 190312 Health Code - Restricting the Sale, Manufacture, and Distribution of Tobacco Products; and

WHEREAS, based on figures provided in the June 13, 2017 Office of Economic Analysis Economic Impact Report on the Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco, the Office of Small Business estimates that there may be a $70 million loss in sales per year from banning e-cigarette products; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Small Business Commission requests that, in the spirit of equitable policy administration, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors administer economic mitigation measures in support of San Francisco small business retailers who are licensed to sell tobacco products; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Controller's Office should be directed to conduct an Economic Impact Report on BOS File No. 190312 and an updated report on the impact of BOS File No. 170441; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that economic mitigation measures should be developed in partnership with merchants, the Office of Small Business, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the

Small Business Development Center, the Controller's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and the Board of Supervisors; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that economic mitigation measures be administered in a timely manner and no later than January of 2020 in order to offset anticipated losses due to the implementation of BOS File No. 190312; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that proposed economic mitigation measures be presented to the Small Business Commission for their input and approval.

I hereby certify that the Small Business Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on June 24, 2019.

Regina Dick-Endrizzi
Director, Office of Small Business

Ayes – 6: Adams, Dwight, Laguana, Ortiz-Cartagena, Yee Riley, Zouzounis
Nays – 0
Absent – 1: Dooley

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS
SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
REGINA DICK-ENDRIZZI,
DIRECTOR

DATE: June 24, 2019
RE: SBC Resolution – Economic Mitigation Measures – Background Information

- ~738 San Francisco licensed tobacco retailers who may be economically impacted
- 700+ are non-formula retail small businesses
- San Francisco licensed tobacco retailers have high rates of compliance with local laws
- The Controller's Office estimated in June of 2017 that retailers could **lose a combined $50 million in sales** from a ban on flavored tobacco products
- Based on the Controller's data, it is estimated that retailers could **lose a combined $70 million in sales** from a ban on e-cigarette products[1]:

District	Number of Licensed Tobacco Retailers	Est. Sales Loss from Flavored Tobacco Ban: $50,000,000 (Effective January 2019)	Est. Sales Loss from Ban on Electronic Cigarettes: $70,358,000 (est. Effective January 2020)	Est. Total Combined Loss per District incurred by both bans
1	50	$3,387,500	$4,766,750	$8,154,250
2	46	$3,116,500	$4,385,410	$7,501,910
3	132	$8,943,000	$12,584,220	$21,527,220
4	37	$2,506,750	$3,527,395	$6,034,145
5	75	$5,081,250	$7,150,125	$12,231,375
6	123	$8,333,250	$11,726,205	$20,059,455
7	28	$1,897,000	$2,669,380	$4,566,380
8	59	$3,997,250	$5,624,765	$9,622,015
9	92	$6,233,000	$8,770,820	$15,003,820
10	52	$3,523,000	$4,957,420	$8,480,420
11	44	$2,981,000	$4,195,620	$7,176,620

[1] The June 2017 Economic Impact Report on banning the sale of flavored tobacco products estimated that there are 37,244 adult e-cigarette users. This number has likely gone up. A four pack of e-cigarette liquid tobacco costs ~$20.99. A starter e-cigarette pack costs ~$64.99**.** If the average user consumer spends $157.42 per month and purchases 1 e-cigarette starter kit per year ($64.99), the total estimated loss in sales for the city would be $70,357,640**.** Estimated losses are presented as being evenly distributed. This will likely not be the case. Some stores only sell e-cigarette products and will be forced to close. Some stores only sell traditional cigarettes

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 110, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
T: 415.554.6134 F: 415.558.7844 E: SBC@SFGOV.ORG W: WWW.SFOSB.ORG

- **Small businesses that only sell this product** would have to close six months after enactment
- Economic impact considerations:
  - Ownership/commercial space structure:
    - Measures should consider whether the store owner owns or leases their commercial space. Those who lease are more at risk. Those who own may wish to sell their business, change their business model, sell their property, or lease to a new type of business. Those who lease may have to break their lease due to their business closing, or may have financial challenges in making their commercial rent.
  - Create fast-tracked pathways for businesses to diversify inventory and consumer offerings:
    - Flex retail; Pop-ups with restaurants; Fast tracked permitting with Planning and Building
  - Expand Healthy Retail SF to assist most vulnerable corner stores:
    - The current Healthy Retail SF program assists corner stores in upgrading their storefronts (through SF Shines), transitioning their current consumer offerings to more healthy options through technical assistance and infrastructure support, and assists with long-term business planning. An estimated $70k is spent per store. At minimum, this fund should be expanded to $3.5 million annually to allow for 50 stores to participate per year.
  - Expand technical business assistance for corner stores and grocers:
    - This can be provided through SBDC, OSB, and OEWD.
  - Determine with Controller a valuation of stores that are in danger of closing and develop a tobacco retail permit buy-back program that considers:
    - Discretionary cash flow relative to the product inventory;
    - Number of years the tobacco license has been held;
    - Proximity to localities that will continue to sell e-cigarette and flavored tobacco products;
    - The density of tobacco retail permits in the district.