FILE NO. 250739

Petitions and Communications received from July 2, 2025, through July 10, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 15, 2025.

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 San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission (BHC), submitting updated BHC bylaws. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an amended agenda for the Full Arts Commission meeting on July 7, 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM), submitting a joint response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the June 17, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), and the Department of Public Health (DPH), submitting a joint response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the May 20, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department on the Status of Women (WOM), submitting a Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights for the month of June 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), pursuant to Administrative Code, section 10.100-305(c), submitting an Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF), regarding an ongoing complaint against the San Francisco Zoological Society. File No. 25003. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Department of Recreation and Park Department (REC), regarding an ongoing Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) complaint against the San Francisco Zoological Society. File No. 25003. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the July 10, 2025, ISCOTT meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Sections 67.29-6, 10.100-305, and 10.100-306, submitting an Annual Report on Gifts and Donations up to $10,000, and donations to the homicide reward fund. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Ordinance No. 131-24, submitting a 2025 Water Bond Savings Report. File No. 240455. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), regarding the proposed Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250655. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee, submitting a Resolution in support of connecting Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park, and improving bicyclist and pedestrian safety. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), submitting a memo on Family Shelter Length Policy. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the San Francisco Public Library (LIB), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305, submitting an Annual Gift Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Ordinance No. 101-20, submitting a Quarterly Report (April - June 2025) on the Status of the Green Infrastructure Grant Program. File No. 200454. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From the San Francisco Police Commission, submitting a Resolution approving the acceptance of a donation of a soft interview room designed by the non-profit organization Project Beloved, for the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), valued at $2,275.08. Police Commission Resolution No. 25-54. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Form. 4 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on July 8, 2025, at 3:00 p.m., to consider renewal and expansion of a property-based business improvement district, known as the Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District. File No. 250371. 18 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to resolve dispute regarding reimbursement for medical services and treatment by renewing their contract, thereby continuing to preserve members' ability to access crucial healthcare services. File No. 250728. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Kim Forwood, regarding the Motion directing the Budget and Legislative Analyst to conduct a comprehensive performance and management audit of the San Francisco Zoo for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2024-2025 and 2025-2026. File No. 241027; Motion No. M24-125. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Daniel Schereck, regarding a proposed AT&T Wireless Telecommunications Services pole at 350 Amber Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From James Patterson, regarding fireworks at Sunset Dunes. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Yamamoto Yumiko, regarding the Resolution retroactively authorizing the San Francisco Arts Commission to accept a gift of art, entitled "Comfort Women's" Column of Strength." File No. 171070. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Cruise LLC, pursuant to California Labor Code, Section 1401, submitting a supplemental Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification (WARN) Act notice. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Rishav Rout, regarding benches in the Mission district. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance authorizing the City to reallocate approximately $34,777,000 in prior appropriated revenue and unappropriated earned interest within the Our City, Our Home ("OCOH") Fund, to allow the City to use revenues from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax through Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-2027 for certain types of services to address homelessness, notwithstanding the expenditure percentages set forth in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810; where future revenue and interest to the OCOH Fund exceeds amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, authorizing the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional revenues and interest deposited on any programs to address homelessness as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810, without regard to the expenditure

percentages in that section; temporarily suspending the limit on funding for short-term rental subsidies; and finding that these reallocations are necessary to achieve the purposes of the Our City, Our Home Fund pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2811. File No. 250609. 279 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Susan Wilpitz, regarding the proposed Resolution authorizing the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park in accordance with Park Code provisions that authorize SFMTA rate-setting on park property. File No. 250617. Copy: Each supervisor. (28)

From Eileen Boken, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to prohibit the City from providing City funds or resources to any organization established under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code ("501(c)(4) organization"); to prohibit any organization established under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code ("501(c)(3) organization") that contracts or subcontracts with the City from providing funds or resources obtained from the City, or anything of value, including personal contact information, obtained using such City funds or resources, to any 501(c)(4) organization; and to require City Departments that provide City funds or resources to, or co-sponsor a community event with, a 501(c)(3) organization to obtain an attestation from the 501(c)(3) organization that it shall not provide City funds or resources, or any personal contact information obtained in connection with the event or with the use of City funds or resources, to any 501(c)(4) organization. File No. 241211. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250655. 212 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation

and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes. File No. 250604. 16 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Peter Birke, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to 1) create a procurement legislative analysis authority for the City Administrator; 2) revise or create threshold dollar amounts for application of various contract requirements tied to the statutory Minimum Competitive Amount or statutory federal Single Audit Standard; 3) reorganize, standardize, and narrow Chapter 12F (relating to the MacBride Principles concerning Northern Ireland; including sunset of ordinance in 2035); 4) repeal Chapter 12J (relating to City business with Burma); and 5) narrow coverage of, and reduce meeting requirements in, Chapter 12L (relating to certain non-profit organizations receiving funds from the City); and amending the Labor and Employment Code to 6) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount, and update Article 131 (relating to nondiscrimination under City contracts; including sunset of ordinance in 2036) and repeal Article 132 (relating to nondiscrimination under City property contracts), while incorporating some of its provisions under Article 131; 7) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create a threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount and update Article 151 (relating to City procurement of sweatfree goods; including abolition of the Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group and sunset of ordinance in 2035); and 8) repeal Article 141 (relating to salary history in the hiring process of City contractors), Article 142 (relating to criminal history in the hiring and employment process of City contractors), and Article 161 (relating to earned income credit forms for employees of City contractors). File No. 250192. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From members of the public, regarding the Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or “e-bike”) incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment. File No. 240967; Ordinance No. 268-24. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the City to approve one new homeless shelter, transitional housing facility, behavioral health residential care and treatment facility, or behavioral health specialized outpatient clinic (collectively, “Covered Facilities”) in each Supervisorial District by June 30, 2026, and prohibiting the City from approving a Covered Facility that would be located within 1,000 feet of another Covered Facility unless the Board of Supervisors waives the 1,000 foot rule by Resolution based on a finding that approving the Covered Facility at the proposed location is in the public interest. File No. 250487. 14 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From members of the public, regarding the regarding the 2025 Housing Element Rezoning and related policies. File Nos. 250700 and 250701. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From Esfir Shrayber, regarding antisemitism. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From members of the public, regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From Lisa Corley, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From members of the public, regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From members of the public, regarding recreational vehicle (RV) parking restrictions. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From Werner Blumer, regarding California State Senate Bill 63 (Wiener, Arreguín), regarding transportation funding. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From Andrew Eljumaily, regarding the installation of a protected bikeway on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

Item 1

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: BHC Bylaws updated.
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:09:12 PM
Attachments:	SKM_C451i25070214100.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached updated Bylaws of the San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Gray, Amber (DPH) <amber.gray@sfdph.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:23 PM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: BHC Bylaws updated.

See updated BHC
Bylaws.

Ms. Amber Gray Pronouns(she/her) What's this?

Health Program Coordinator 1
San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission
Behavioral Health Services, DPH
1380 Howard Street, 2nd floor.
San Francisco, California 94103
Behavioral Health Commission
P: 415 255-3474
F: 415-255-3700
C: 415-297-5950
The SF Health Network is the City's only comprehensive system of care. Our top goal is to improve the value of services provided to our patients, staff and San Franciscans.

PRIVACY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you believe you have received this email message in error, please contact the above sender immediately by a reply email and please destroy all copies of the original message.

BYLAWS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION

The San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission
1380 Howard Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: sfbhc@sfdph.org
https://www.sf.gov/departments/behavioral-health-commission

Submitted June 30, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE I – NAME....3

ARTICLE II – AUTHORITY, POWERS AND DUTIES....3

ARTICLE III – MEMBERSHIP....5

ARTICLE IV – MEETINGS....8

ARTICLE VI – ELECTION OF OFFICERS....10

ARTICLE VIII – COMMITTEES....12

ARTICLE IX – ATTENDANCE, VACANCIES, AND REMOVAL....15

ARTICLE X – RESIGNATIONS AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE....15

ARTICLE XI – CONDUCT OF BUSINESS....16

ARTICLE XII – AMENDMENTS....17

ARTICLE XIII – CODE OF CONDUCT....17

ARTICLE XIV – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES....18

CERTIFICATE....18

BYLAWS OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OF SAN FRANCISCO

ARTICLE I – NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco, formerly known as the Mental Health Board (MHB) of San Francisco. "Behavioral Health" includes mental health and substance use disorder programs and services.

ARTICLE II – AUTHORITY, POWERS AND DUTIES

The San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission (BHC) is established pursuant to Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code § 5604, *et* §§ 15.12-15.14.

The purpose of the BHC is to:

1. Review and evaluate the community's public behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems in any facility within the City and County of San Francisco (City) where behavioral health evaluations or services are being provided, including but not limited to, schools, emergency departments, and psychiatric facilities. Facilities utilized out of the city to serve San Francisco residents with behavioral health needs, such as state hospitals and residential treatment programs, may be included in reviews and evaluations.

2. Review any City agreements entered into pursuant to California. Welfare and Institutions Code § 5650. The BHC shall make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) regarding concerns identified within these agreements.

3. Advise the BOS, the Director of Health, the Health Commission, and the Director of Behavioral Health Services (BHS) and Mental Health SF (MHSF) as to any aspect of the local behavioral health programs.

4. Request assistance, when needed, from the local patients' rights advocates when reviewing and advising on behavioral health evaluations or services provided in public facilities with limited access.

5. Review and approve the procedures used to ensure citizen and professional involvement at all stages of the planning process. Involvement shall include individuals with lived experience of mental health conditions, substance use disorders, or both, and their families, community members, advocacy organizations, and behavioral health professionals. It shall also include other professionals that interact with individuals living with mental health conditions or substance use disorders daily, such as education, emergency services, employment, health care, housing, law enforcement, local business owners, social services, seniors, transportation, and veterans.

6. Review the procedures used to ensure the involvement of interested members of the behavioral health community and the public in the development of the budget for behavioral health services and report on its findings to the BOS.

7. Submit, in June, an Annual Report to the Director of BHS, MHSF and BOS on the needs and performance of the City's behavioral health care system.

8. Review and make recommendations on applicants for the appointment of Director of BHS and MHSF. The BHC shall be included in the selection process prior to the selection of a person to fill this position.

9. Review and comment on the City's performance outcome data and communicate its findings to the California Behavioral Health Planning Council and/or any other state designated agency that gathers such data. All such communications shall be reported to the BOS, BHC, the Health Commission, DPH, and the Directors of BHS and MHSF.

10. Assess the impact of the realignment of services from the State to the City on behavioral health services delivered to clients and on the local community.

11. Conduct a public hearing on the draft Behavioral Health Services Act three-year program and expenditure plan and annual updates at the close of the 30-day comment period as required by Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code § 5848, subsection (a). Each adopted plan and update shall include any substantive written recommendations for revisions. The BHC shall review the adopted plan or update and make recommendations to the Directors of BHS and MHSF, the Health Commission, the Director of Health, and the [EVBDO(1S].

12. Work collaboratively with behavioral health providers and other interested groups on issues of mutual concern.

13. Comply with all applicable laws, including but not limited to the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Government Code §§ 54950, et seq.) and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (S.F. Administrative Code §§ 67.1, et seq.) in publishing notices, agendas, and minutes and carrying out its operations and functions. Where publication or posting on a website is required, the BHC shall use the Department of Public Health's website, or another website designated by the Department of Public Health.

ARTICLE III – MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Behavioral Health Commission shall be as follows:

1. Consistent with Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code § 5604(a) and S.F. Administrative Code § 15.12, the number of members on the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco shall be 12.

2. The BHC shall ensure the composition of the Commission represents and reflects the diversity and demographics of the City as a whole, as well as the population served by the BHS and DPH to the extent feasible.

3. The activities and affairs of individual members of the Commission, acting as Commission members, shall be conducted, and powers exercised, by and under the direction of the BHC and these Bylaws.

4. Except for the BOS member, the term of each member of the BHC shall be three years. The clerk of the Commission in consultation with the Clerk of the BOS, shall assign existing Commission members, including members with expired terms serving as holdover appointees, to Seats 2-12 in accordance with the requirements of S.F. Administrative Code § 15.12. The Clerk of the BOS shall equitably stagger the appointments so that approximately one-third of the appointments expire in each year, as required by California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 5604(c). New appointments made to Commission Seats 2-12 shall be made in accordance with S.F. Administrative Code § 15.12. The Board of Supervisors member shall be appointed to Seat 1.

5. No member shall serve more than two consecutive full terms. A member shall be deemed to have served a full term only if the member serves at least half of a full term. The term of office of a member appointed by an individual BOS member is not affected by the Board of Supervisors member no longer continuing in that office.

6. The BHC serves in an advisory role to the BOS, and one member of the BOS shall be a member of the BHC.

7. Six of the seats on the BHC (or 50%) shall be reserved for consumers, or the parents, spouses, siblings, or adult children of consumers, who are receiving or have received behavioral health services. At least three of the six seats shall be held by consumers, at least three of the 6 seats shall be held by family members of consumers, and at least one of the 6 seats shall be held by an individual who is 25 years or younger. Family members may include consumers' domestic partners and significant others.

8. One member of the BHC shall be a child advocate (a family member or consumer advocate for minors who use behavioral health services); one member shall be an older adult advocate (a family member or consumer advocate for persons 60 years of age or older who use behavioral health services); and two members shall be from the following professions: psychiatry, psychology, behavioral health social work, nursing with a specialty in behavioral health, marriage and family counseling, psychiatric technology, or administrator of a hospital/hospice providing behavioral health services or of a community mental health facility.

9. One member shall be a veteran or a veteran advocate. Veteran advocate means a parent, spouse or adult child of a veteran, or an individual who is part of a veteran's organization, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion. To comply with this requirement, BHS must notify its County Veterans Service Office (CVSO) about vacancies on the BHC.

10. One member shall be an employee of a local education agency. To comply with the requirement, BHS shall notify its county office of education about vacancies on the BHC.

11. For the remaining BHC seats, the BOS is encouraged to appoint individuals who have experience with and knowledge of the behavioral health system. This includes members of the community that engage with individuals living with a behavioral health condition in the course of daily operations, such as representatives of offices of education, large

and small businesses, hospitals, physicians practicing in emergency departments, police chief, sheriffs, and community and nonprofit service providers.

12. Except as provided below, a member of the BHC or the member's spouse shall not be a full time or part-time employee of BHS, an employee of the California Department of Health Care Services, or an employee of, or a paid member of the governing body of a behavioral health contract agency.

13. A consumer of behavioral health services who has obtained employment with an employer described above, and who holds a position in which the consumer does not have any interest, influence, or authority over any financial or contractual The Commissioner shall abstain from voting on any financial or contractual issue concerning the member's employer that may come before the BHC.

14. BHC Commissioners shall abstain from voting on any issue in which the member has a financial interest as defined in Cal. Government Code § 87103.

15. A Commissioner shall be removed from office if the Commissioner has four (4) unexcused absences from regular meetings in one calendar year where no leave or excusal has been granted.

16. A leave of absence may be granted for up to four months with prior approval from the Executive Committee.

17. In cases of medical illness, family emergency, parental leave, or other exigency, the Executive Committee may retroactively grant leave, as necessary. The city's parental Leave Policy Administrative Code Chapter 67B.

18. The BHC may grant leaves of absence for one or more meetings. Upon determining that a member has been absent for four meetings in a 12-month period and that no leave of absence had been granted for these meetings, the BHC shall provide written notification to the Clerk of the BOS. Upon receipt of the notification, the position shall be deemed vacant.

19. The BHC may vote to excuse an absent member from a BHC meeting. Whenever the BHC does not take such a vote, then the minutes of the meeting from which the member is absent shall note that the absence is unexcused. Regular attendance at the BHC meetings is critical to the BHC's ongoing success.

20. The Commission may recommend to the BOS that a member be removed from the BHC on the grounds that the member's conduct is seriously disruptive of the functioning of the BHC. Once the BHC makes such a recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may remove a member from the BHC if it determines that the member's conduct is seriously disruptive of the functioning of the BHC.

21. No Commissioner shall be compensated for duties performed as a member of the BHC. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, a commissioner may be reimbursed for the actual costs of attending meetings, conferences, or similar gatherings if attendance at the meeting, conference or similar gathering is approved in advance in writing by the BHC Chair.

ARTICLE IV – MEETINGS

1. Meetings of the BHC shall be held monthly as designated by the BHC, for a minimum of 11 meetings per year. Meetings may be held in person, or virtually via teleconference, as permitted by Cal. Government Code § 54953.

2. The BHC is subject to the provisions of the Brown Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Cal. Government Code §§54950 et seq. and S.F. Administrative Code §§ 67.1, et seq. respectively.

3. **Annual Meetings.** There shall be, which shall constitute the annual meeting of the BHC, to be held in February of each year, a regular meeting schedule will be adopted for the next twelve (12) months, and officer elections held.

4. **Regular Meetings:** The BHC shall establish by resolution or motion the time and place for holding regular meetings at its annual meeting.

5. **Special Meetings:** Special meetings, including ad hoc meetings, for any purpose or purposes related to the business of the BHC, may be called at any time by the Chair or the Co-Chairs or by a majority of the BHC members in accordance with the Brown Act and San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Any special meeting notice must be posted on the BHC web site, delivered to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and to the Government Information Center at the Main Branch of the SF Public Library, and to any members of the media who have requested notice in writing, subject to the same public notice requirements described below for regular meetings.

6. If a special meeting will be held in a building other than its regular meeting place, BHC must give public notice of the meeting at least 15 days in advance. (S.F. Administrative Code § 67.6(f)). The 15-day notice requirement does not apply if the special meeting is held in the same building as the BHC's regular meeting place, but a different room. The 15-day notice does need to include a formal agenda but should specify the time and place of the meeting and generally identify the nature and purpose of the meeting. BHC must post a formal agenda 72 hours in advance of the meeting, as with all special meetings.

7. Actual notice of Annual and Regular Meetings shall be received by each member of the BHC at least 72 hours before the time set for the meeting by one of the following methods:

- Personal delivery of written notice; or
- First class mail, postage prepaid sent by first class mail shall be deposited in the U.S. Mail not less than five (5) days before the time set for the meeting; or
- Fax transmittal or e-mail of written notice; or
- Telephone, either directly to the member or to a person at the member's office who would reasonably be expected to communicate that notice promptly to the member; and,
- All such notices shall be given or sent to the member's address or telephone number as shown on the records of the BHC.

8. Notice of regular and special meetings shall be provided in accordance with the Brown Act and S.F. Sunshine Ordinance.

9. A quorum for a BHC meeting is one person more than half of the number of members designated by law, rather than the number of seats actually filled. Currently this is seven (7) Commissioners.

10. Each Commissioner present must vote on every question put to a vote, unless excused by a majority vote of the BHC, or unless a recognized conflict of interest exists, as provided for in the S.F. Administrative Code.

ARTICLE V – OFFICERS

1. The officers shall be Commissioners elected for the positions of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. There may be two Co-Chairs sharing the duties of the Chair.

ARTICLE VI – ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. Officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the BHC in February of even-numbered years and shall serve a term of two (2) years, or until their successors are elected.

2. Nominating Committee shall be appointed by the Chair or Co-Chairs, following consultation with the Executive Committee, by the November meeting of each odd-numbered year and shall consist of no fewer than three (3) Commissioners. The Nominating Committee shall:

   a. Select at least one (1) candidate for each office.
   b. Secure from each candidate their written or verbal consent to serve; and
   c. Report the slate to the BHC at its January meeting.

3. Prior to voting for BHC officers, additional nominations may be made from the floor by Commissioners.

4. Elections shall be by roll-call vote.

5. Vacancies occurring in the offices between elections shall be filled in the following manner:

a. At its next meeting the Chair or Co-Chairs, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall appoint a Nominating Committee.
b. The Nominating Committee shall then meet within 15 days.
c. At the next BHC meeting the Nominating Committee shall present its report to the BHC, and elections shall then occur, with nominations being accepted from the floor.

6. Officers may be removed from office for failure to carry out the duties of their office by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the BHC, provided that forty-five (45) days' notice is given to all Commissioners.

7. If the Chair's office is vacated prior to the end of the two-year term, the Vice Chair shall assume the Chair's office and a replacement Vice Chair nominated a the next regularly scheduled meeting. The election for the new Vice Chair shall be held at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the nomination meeting.

ARTICLE VII – DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. The Chair or Co-Chairs shall be the official spokesperson(s) of the BHC and shall carry out the policies of the BHC. The Chair or Co- Chairs shall preside at all meetings of the BHC and the Executive Committee and shall consult with the Directors of BHS and MHSF. The Chair or Co- Chairs is/are ex-officio voting member(s) of all standing and ad hoc committees, but not of the Nominating Committee Nominating Committee.

2. The Vice Chair shall serve as an aide to the Chair, shall consult with Directors of BHS and MHSF at the request of the Chair, and shall serve as Acting Chair in the Chair's absence.

3. The Secretary shall take minutes, or review the minutes prepared by other Commissioners or staff, of all BHC monthly meetings and Committee meetings prior to approval by the BHC and serve as Acting Chair in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair.

ARTICLE VIII – COMMITTEES

Section 1: Overview of Committees

1. A member of the BHC shall serve on at least one committee or work group.

2. The duties of the Chair or Co-Chairs shall be to at least annually establish or confirm ad hoc, work groups and standing committees; appoint the Chairs of such committees, groups, and any liaisons to other groups, organizations, task forces or committees; or discontinue any committee or work group.

3. The duties of the Committee shall be to:
   a. Set agenda for committee meetings.
   b. Assure 72-hour notice and agenda re posted on website, prior to convening meeting.
   c. Conduct Committee meetings.
   d. Perform or oversee any special projects assigned to the Committee.
   e. Perform or assign a Committee Member or staff to take meeting minutes.
   f. Report on Committee's activities to the Executive Committee and the full BHC, at their respective monthly meetings.

4. **Ad hoc committees** may be established or eliminated in accordance with notice and agenda requirements in Article IV, above, by the Chair or Co-Chairs, with concurrence of the Executive Committee. Ad hoc committees include, but are not limited to: Nominating Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Retreat Committee, Bylaws Revisions Committee, Annual Report Committee, Planning Council Study Committee, Annual BHSA Plan Review and Public Hearing, and Recruitment and Outreach Committees.

5. **Standing Committees** include, but are not limited to: Executive Committee, Implementation Committee, and Rules and Reports Committee. Standing Committees may be established or eliminated in accordance with notice and agenda requirements in Article by the BHC. Standing Committees have ongoing responsibilities concerning a particular subject matter that is not time limited.

6. Committees and work groups will conduct meetings in accordance with the Brown Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Cal. Government Code §§§ 54950et seq.; S.F. Administrative Code, §§ 67.1 et seq.

Section 2: Standing Committees

1. **The Executive Committee** shall consist of the BHC officers, chairs of the standing committees and one (1) at-large commissioner to be appointed by the Chair or Co-Chairs. The at-large commissioner is to be chosen from any category that is under-represented on the Executive Committee, e.g., gender, ethnic or sexual minority, or membership category (consumer, professional, etc.). The at-large commissioner will be a regular voting member of the Executive Committee. The duties of the Executive Committee shall include:

a. Draft agendas for regular and special meetings of the BHC.
b. Review and proofread the Annual Report as specified in Article II, Section 7 of these Bylaws.
c. Handle urgent matters at properly noticed meetings within established policy between regular or special meetings with ratification of all action required by a majority vote of the full BHC at its next regular or special meeting, and to carry out any duties ordered by the full BHC.
d. Coordinate with BHC staff, submit budget suggestions to DPH/BHS, and monitor monthly BHC expenditures [EVD(2].
e. Shall meet monthly (11 months) each year.
f. Hold a special session, at the call of the Chair or Co-Chairs with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, or upon the receipt of a written request signed by at least four (4) Commissioners [EVD(3].
g. Such a special session shall be held within five (5) days of the Chair or Co-Chair's receipt of the written request and posted 72 hours on the BHC website prior to the convening of the meeting.
h. Proactively engage to resolve any internal and external conflicts related to behavioral health and BHC. The committee may only take action at a properly noticed meeting.

2. **The Implementation Committee** shall devise and implement strategies for accomplishing the goals and objectives of the BHC. All BHC Commissioners shall have a proactive role in setting goals and objectives. The Implementation Committee shall:

a. Convene monthly;
b. Recommend which program areas, under the BHC's jurisdiction, should receive significant attention, using tools such as the BHC Strategic Plan and the BHS and MHSF Director's monthly report to the BHC; and,

c. Research and attend community meetings and investigate relevant issues, such

as City task forces or working groups formed by the BOS, DPH, or Mayor, and report this information back to the BHC membership and constituents.

2.1. Program Review/Site Visit Workgroup shall be responsible for assisting the Commission in making at least four (4) visits annually to public behavioral health programs, utilizing the most current "BHC Site Visit Manual [EVD(4) [TB5]" for procedures and forms. The Workgroup shall:

a. Convene monthly as part of the Implementation Committee.
b. Review and revise the "BHC Site Visit Manual" as necessary
c. Ensure that a copy of the "BHC Site Visit Manual" is distributed to each Commissioner.
d. Verify that all Site Visit Summaries and Reports have been submitted to the BHC Clerk.

3. **The Rules and Reports Committee** shall be responsible for overseeing matters pertaining to the BHC's rules and procedures, the reporting of committee activities, and the preparation of annual reports. The Rules and Reports Committee shall:

a. Convene monthly.
b. Review the commission's rules and procedures, and make recommendations, changes, or updates.
c. Prepare reports of committee activities, using the results of program reviews and site visits, program presentations made at commission or committee meetings, public hearings, and other relevant sources. These reports serve as a historical record of commission actions. Submit copies of the reports to the directors of BHS, BHSA, the BOS, and other stakeholders.
d. Assist in producing reports resulting from oversight or legislative activities, including the county's annual performance outcome data. Additionally, communicate data notebook findings to the California Behavioral Health Planning Council [WIC 5604.2 (a)(7)].

ARTICLE IX – ATTENDANCE, VACANCIES, AND REMOVAL

1. All BHC members are required to contact the BHC Chair or Secretary or the designated DPH staff person [EVD(6)] prior to a meeting if they are unable to attend. Failure to do so will result in an unexcused absence.

2. A BHC member may be deemed by the Executive Committee to have ceased to discharge the duties of a BHC member based on lack of attendance or if the member's conduct is seriously disruptive of the functioning of the BHC. If after review, the Executive Committee determines by majority vote of the Executive Committee members present, that they should be referred to the full BHC for a vote, the matter will be brought will be made to the full BHC as an action item. The BHC may recommend the removal of the BHC member to the Board of Supervisors if two-thirds (2/3) of those Commissioners in attendance at a regular or special meeting at which a quorum is present vote in favor of making the recommendation for removal to the Board of Supervisors.

3. If a vacancy occurs due to the occurrence of any of the events described, the Secretary or staff shall advise the BHC. The Executive Committee may commence the recruitment for a replacement and make recommendations to the BHC, which may in turn, make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

ARTICLE X – RESIGNATIONS AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE

1. Any member may resign effective upon giving written notice to the Clerk of the BOS with a copy to the Chair or Co-Chairs, Vice Chair, or Secretary of the BHC. A notice which specifies a later time shall be effective upon the date of the resignation set forth in said notice.

2. A BHC member, who does not wish to resign and who needs leave from BHC commitments, may request a leave of absence for personal reasons. The request must be submitted in writing to the Chair or Co-Chairs of the BHC. The Executive Committee may approve this request for a period of time not to exceed four (4) months. A Commissioner on leave may request an extension in writing to the Chair or Co-Chairs and such extension is subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. The request for extension will be reviewed by the Executive Committee as to the reasonableness of the extension and the overall impact on the Board in carrying out its responsibilities.

ARTICLE XI – CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

1. The parliamentary authority for the BHC shall be the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, to the extent to which it is consistent with these Bylaws, as well as all other applicable federal, state, or City legislation or regulation. All meetings must conform to the Brown Act and S.F. Administrative Code.

2. Public Testimony. The Chair may require persons speaking before the BHC or at committee to confine their remarks to the question before the BHC or committee, or, if speaking during the public comment period for non-agenda items, to matters within the BHC's subject matter jurisdiction. The Chair may also establish uniform speaker time limits at the beginning of each agenda item or public comment and may limit the total time for public comment on any item.

(References: Government Code section 54954.3(a), (b)(1); 78 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 224 (1995).)

3. Disorderly Conduct. The presiding officer may turn off the microphone or may order removed from the meeting room any person who commits the following acts in respect to a meeting of the BHC or of a standing or special committee:

a. Disorderly, contemptuous or insolent behavior toward the BHC or committee or any member thereof, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
b. A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting.
c. Disobedience of any lawful order of the presiding officer, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the BHC or committee.
d. Usage and ringing of cell phones and pagers not in silent mode, in BHC and committee meetings.
e. Any other interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting.
f. BHC Commissioners should be protected at all times

(References: Government Code, section 54957.9; White v. City of Norwalk (9th Cir. 1990) 900 F.2d 1421; Kindt v. Santa Monica Rent Control Board (9th Cir. 1995) 67 F.3d 266; Norse v. City of Santa Cruz (9th Cir. 2010) 629 F.3d 966; Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa 9th Cir. 2013) 718 F.3d 800.)

ARTICLE XII – AMENDMENTS

1. These Bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the BHC by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Commission when 15 days' notice has been given as described below. The BHC shall use the following procedure when amending the Bylaws:

a. Proposals for change shall be noticed on the BHC agenda and a written copy sent to all BHC members a minimum of five (5) days prior to the meeting date on which proponents wish consideration and a vote on the change.
b. The BHC must approve the change by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of those Commissioners in attendance at a regular or special meeting at which a quorum is present.
c. The change, as approved, is to be signed and dated by the BHC Chair or Co-Chairs.
d. Amended Bylaws should be presented to each BHC member at the next regularly scheduled meeting.
e. Bylaws shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years recommending revisions to be presented to the Behavioral Health Commission for approval.
f. An original copy signed by the BHC Chair or Co-Chairs are to be filed with the BHC Secretary. Additionally, an appropriate historical log of all Bylaw amendments and the date of the changes are to be maintained by the BHC Secretary. The historical log is to be distributed to BHC members whenever revisions are recommended.
g. All Commissioners will be provided with the current BHC Bylaws and a proposed Policies and Procedures [EVD(7] manual.

2. These Bylaws and any amendments to these Bylaws must be approved by the Board of Supervisors before they may become effective.

ARTICLE XIII – CODE OF CONDUCT

The BHC is committed to providing a welcoming, respectful, friendly, safe, supportive, bully free, and harassment-free environment for Commissioners, staff, presenters, and members of the public, and expects all such individuals to act professionally, respecting the personal rights and dignities of all to create a productive, inclusive environment. All individuals should feel welcome and safe within the BHC regardless of their sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, pregnancy, race, color, ethnicity, national origin, ancestry,

religion, creed, age, physical or mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, military or veteran status, body size, domestic violence victim status, employment status, type of employment, or any other legally protected classifications. All Commissioners and all others associated with the BHC shall comply with the applicable Code of Conduct as stated in the BHC Bylaws.

ARTICLE XIV – POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The BHC may establish Policies and Procedures on matters not covered by these Bylaws.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Bylaws of the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco and that such Bylaws were duly adopted by the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco on the date set forth below.

Chair or Co-Chairperson(s)

Adopted: June 10, 2025

Item 2

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: July 07, 2025 SFAC Full Commission Agenda Posted
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:49:17 PM
Attachments:	image001.png July_7_2025_Agenda_-_Full_Commission_Meeting_1.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached amended agenda for the Full Arts Commission meeting for July 7, 2025.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:01 PM
Subject: July 07, 2025 SFAC Full Commission Agenda Posted

Hello,

The amended agenda for the Monday, July 7, 2025, Full Commission meeting has been posted:

Full Arts Commission Meeting | San Francisco (sf.gov)

Agenda

Thank you,
Manraj

From: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART)
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 12:14 PM
Subject: July 07, 2025 SFAC Full Commission Agenda Posted

Hello,

The agenda for the Monday, July 7, 2025, Full Commission meeting has been posted:

Full Arts Commission Meeting | San Francisco (sf.gov)

Agenda

Thank you,
Manraj

Manraj Dhaliwal
Commission Secretary
Pronouns: he/him
Email: manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org
Phone: 415-252-2247
Mobile: 415-940-1803

San Francisco Arts Commission
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

Newsletter | Flickr | LinkedIn | Facebook | Instagram | TikTok | Twitter | YouTube

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone. We affirm the sovereign rights of their community as First Peoples and are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community and uplifting contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the Sunshine Ordinance and can be requested by the public. If this happens,

personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

MEETING OF THE FULL ARTS COMMISSION

Monday, July 7, 2025
2 p.m.
City Hall, Room 416
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

Agenda

Members of the Commission will attend this meeting in person at the location listed above.

Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online SFGovTV2. Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

Arts Commissioners: Charles Collins, President; Janine Shiota, Vice President; JD Beltran, J. Riccardo Benavides, Seth Brenzel, Patrick Carney, Suzie Ferras, Mahsa Hakimi, Yiying Lu, Nabiel Musleh, Jessica Rothschild, Marcus Shelby, Debra Walker, Lydia So, ex officio (non-voting)

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment

1. Call to order
2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
3. Agenda Changes
4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the

Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. Approval of Minutes
Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve June 2, 2025, Draft Minutes

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document: June 2, 2025, Draft Minutes

3. General Public Comment
Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

4. Director's Report
Discussion

Current administrative, budgetary, legislative and programming developments and announcements.

Staff Presenter: Director of Cultural Affairs Ralph Remington

Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

5. Committee Reports and Committee Matters

1. **Civic Design Committee – Debra Walker, Chair**

    1. **Civic Design Committee Report**
    Discussion

    Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

    Report from the Civic Design Committee regarding activities of the Committee and the Projects.

2. **Visual Arts Committee – Suzie Ferras, Chair**

    1. **Visual Arts Committee Report**
    Discussion

    Presentation Time: Approximately 10 minutes

    Report from the Visual Arts Committee regarding activities of the Committee and the Program.

6. Advance Payment Policy Update
Discussion

Staff Presenter: Deputy Director of Finance and Administration Sarah Hollenbeck

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

7. Consent Calendar
Discussion and possible action

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

The following items are included in the Consent Calendar subject to withdrawal at the request of a commissioner.

1. Motion to approve the June 16, 2025, Civic Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes.
2. Motion to approve the June 18, 2025, Visual Arts Committee Meeting Minutes.

Civic Design Review Committee Recommendations (June 16, 2025, *link to agenda*)
Action

3. Motion to approve Phase 2 Review for Jackson Playground Renovation – Phase 2.

Visual Arts Committee Recommendations (June 18, 2025, *link to agenda*)
Action

4. Motion to approve the West Field Campus Public Art Program Plan of Approach, including West Field Garage 2 (670), Cargo Building 626.1, Cargo Building 720.1 and GSE 742.

5. Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal *Infinite Regress: Oro en Paz I and II* by Eamon Ore-Giron for the Terminal 3 West Superhighway Integrated Wall Public Art Project, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

6. Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Eamon Ore-Giron (dba Lengua Inc.) for an amount not to exceed $1,000,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of a mosaic tile artwork for the Terminal 3 West Superhighway Integrated Wall Public Art Project.

7. Motion to approve the conceptual design proposal by Pae White for the Terminal 3 West Suspended Sculpture Public Art Project as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

8. Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a contract with Pae White (dba Pae White Studio, Inc.) for an amount not to exceed $1,000,000 for the design, fabrication, insurance, and consultation during installation of an artwork for the Terminal 3 West Suspended Sculpture Public Art Project.

9. Motion to approve Vida Kuang, Bovey Lee, Mikael Gaspay, Amanda Phingbodhipakkiya, Monyee Chau, and Richard Lee as finalists for the Chinatown Public Health Center interior art wall opportunities, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

10. Motion to approve Dave Young Kim, Sorell Raino-Tsui and Twin Walls Mural Company as finalists for the Chinatown Public Health Center exterior art wall opportunity, as recommended by the Artist Review Panel.

11. Motion to approve the permanent installation of *Glide Heart*, an artwork by Jaz Cameron measuring 5 feet by 6 feet by 40 inches gifted to Glide Memorial Church from The San Francisco General Hospital Foundation's Hearts in San Francisco program, to be installed in the sidewalk in front of Glide Memorial Church on Ellis Street. The sculpture is fabricated from resin and fiberglass with steel structural elements at specific stress points and the base is made of concrete and steel. Glide Memorial Church will be responsible for ongoing maintenance. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection.

8. Adjournment
Action

Agenda posted 07/01/2025 11:20 a.m., msd
Amended agenda posted 07/02/2025, 1:18 p.m., msd

Notices

The meetings of the San Francisco Arts Commission will be held in-person at City Hall Room 416, available to view on SFGovTV2, Comcast 78/Astound 28 and AT&T Uverse 99.

Agenda Item Information / Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:
1) Department or Agency or report;
2) Public correspondence;
3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address

the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Electronic Devices Prohibited
The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting, except as necessary to participate remotely. The Chair may order the exclusion from participation of any person responsible for improper disruptions to this remote meeting.

Disability Access
To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

Archives Available
A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements
Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local

legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone 415/252-3100, fax 415/252-3112 and http://www.sfethics.org/.

Sunshine Ordinance
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102-4689; by phone at 415-554 7724; by fax at 415-554 7854; or by email at sotf@sfgov.org.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/

Accessibility Meeting Policy
Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定
根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料， 和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版

本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電415-252-2247向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN
De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Commission Secretary, Manraj Dhaliwal, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting
Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa. Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Item 3

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Letter of Inquiry Response - 911 Calls for Service at Permanent Supportive Housing Sites
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:03:39 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-azircbsl.png 07.02.2025_LOI Response_Dorsey_911 Calls for Service at PSH Sites.pdf Clerk"s Memo - Dorsey - 061725 Mtg.pdf

Hello,

Please see the attached joint response from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the June 17, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Carroll, Maryellen (DEM) <maryellen.carroll@sfgov.org>; Smuts, Robert (DEM) <robert.smuts@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Scanlon, Olivia (DEM) <olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS)

<dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Inquiry Response - 911 Calls for Service at Permanent Supportive Housing Sites

Good afternoon,

Attached please find attached the joint response from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and the Department of Emergency Management to Supervisor Dorsey's Letter of Inquiry regarding 911 calls for service at permanent supportive housing sites.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (She/Hers)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
dylan.schneider@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Honorable Supervisor Matt Dorsey

Date: July 2, 2025

From: Emily Cohen, HSH Deputy Director and Robert Smuts, DEM Deputy Director

Subject: Letter of Inquiry Response – 911 Calls for Service at Permanent Supportive Housing Sites

---

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you for your Letter of Inquiry regarding 911 Calls for Service at Permanent Supportive Housing Sites received on June 17, 2025.

To respond to this inquiry, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) gathered all 911 calls for service across the 156 permanent supportive housing (PSH) sites in San Francisco. These calls were then categorized by type of service call – e.g. medical, police, fire.

We look forward to continuing this discussion with you and your office. If you have any further questions, please contact Dylan Schneider, HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs at dylan.schneider@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Emily Cohen
Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

Robert Smuts
Department of Emergency Management

Permanent Supportive Housing

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing funds over 9,300 units of site based permanent supportive housing (PSH) for formerly homeless adults, transitional age youth and families with children. PSH is an evidence-based model and the most successful intervention for addressing chronic homelessness for people with complex social and medical needs.

Site-based PSH currently provides homes for 8,269 households with 9,957 individuals, all of whom have histories of homelessness and complex social, health and/or behavioral health needs. Over the past few years, we have seen the acuity of PSH tenants increase as we began prioritizing people with high needs and the longest experiencing homelessness for this intervention. 91% of current PSH tenants are adult (inclusive of transitional age youth) households and 9% are families with children. Among adult tenants we are seeing the population age, and with that comes associated health care vulnerabilities and needs. Currently 53% of adult PSH tenants are over the age of 55 years.

PSH provides homes to some of the lowest income San Franciscans. 70% of PSH tenants have a total income of less than $1,000 per month and 30% of tenants have no earned income.

Key demographics of adult tenants in PSH include:

44% of adult tenants are white and 34% are black
21% identify as Latine or Hispanic
15% identify as LGBTQ+
69% identify as men, 26% as women and 4% as transgender or gender diverse.

Due to the eligibility criteria and prioritization processes for PSH, we are currently severing a community with significant disabilities, including:

48% of adult tenants in PSH report 2+ long-term disabling conditions
42% report a long-term mental health condition
39% report a long-term chronic health condition
34% report a long-term physical disability
29% report a long-term substance use disorder
12% report a developmental disorder
7% report HIV/AIDS
17% identify as domestic violence survivors

In addition to adults, HSH also serves families with children in PSH. 992 of current tenants (44%) in family site-based PSH are children under the age of 18 and 5% of households are headed by Transitional Age Youth between 18-24 years old. Families with children living in PSH are

extremely low income. 78% of family heads of household report a total monthly income of less than $1,500 and 27% report no earned income.

Key demographics for families living in PSH, include:

- 40% of family heads of household are black, 27% are white and 10% are Latine/Hispanic (and no other race)
- 35% identify as Latine or Hispanic
- 5% identify as LGBTQ+
- 82% of heads of household identify as women, 15% as men, and less than 1% as transgender or gender diverse

Families living in PSH also have significant rates of disabilities, including:

- 24% of family heads of household report 2+ long-term disabling conditions
- 32% report a long-term mental health condition
- 20% report a long-term chronic health condition
- 15% report a long-term physical disability
- 9% report a long-term substance use disorder
- 6% report a developmental disorder
- 3% report having HIV/AIDS
- 36% identify as domestic violence survivors

This information is important context for understanding the needs of tenants in PSH and the factors contributing to 911 calls for emergency services.

911 Call Data, Trends and Notes of Caution

The attached data shows the number of emergency calls for service from Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) properties between 2020 and 2025. Over these years we have a few projects that closed and several projects that opened which you can see in the data.

The raw data on calls for service shows the number and types of calls associated with each address but does not compare the information with other buildings of comparable sizes. Therefore, it is challenging to make a determination on if a property has a disproportionately high number of calls.

An additional factor to take into consideration when reviewing this data is the high medical vulnerability and advanced age of people living in site-based PSH. This is the likely driver behind the number of medical calls for service.

Lastly, it is important to note that PSH buildings vary significantly by the number of units in each building. We have included the number of units and population housed in each building to help ensure that as you make comparisons between programs, you are comparing like buildings and

populations. Finally, many HSH funded PSH units live within larger affordable housing buildings – for example an affordable housing building may have 100 units but only 20 are PSH. In the attached data we noted the number of PSH units associated with each address.

Data Caveats

The data team at the Department of Emergency Management pulled the monthly call data for each address associated with site-based PSH. There are several points about the data that are important to consider for any analysis.

- **All Dispatched Calls to PSH Sites by Month** – This is an unduplicated count of all Incidents at the addresses of the PSH sites. If Police and Fire both showed up it should be only counted once.
- **Police Calls to PSH Sites by Month** – This is a (mostly) unduplicated count of police calls to PSH addresses. On occasion there will be two police-related calls that started around the same time and were later connected but retain different call numbers and are therefore counted twice.
- **EMS Calls to PSH Sites by Month and Fire Calls to PSH Sites by Month** – same as Police Calls above. There are also instances where Fire and EMS calls begin at the same time and are merged but retain the original two call numbers.

Police, Fire, and EMS tabs will not equal the "All Dispatched Calls" tab due to overlap between Police and Fire on calls where both are on scene.

TOTAL INCIDENTS

PSH Site	Population	Current unit count (or max unit cc if closed)	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020	Jun 2020	Jul 2020	Aug 2020	Sep 2020	Oct 2020	Nov 2020	Dec 2020	Jan 2021	Feb 2021	Mar 2021	Apr 2021	May 2021	Jun 2021	Jul 2021	Aug 2021	Sep 2021	Oct 2021	Nov 2021	Dec 2021	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022	Dec 2022	Jan 2023	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023	Jan 2024	Feb 2024	Mar 2024	Apr 2024	May 2024	Jun 2024	Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Sep 2024	Oct 2024	Nov 2024	Dec 2024	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mar 2025	Apr 2025	May 2025	Jun 2025
1036 Mission	Family	40	20	24	27	15	17	16	7	14	25	15	27	19	10	14	14	29	29	10	27	21	12	12	17	22	16	17	18	12	18	20	11	18	16	18	16	15	11	10	15	22	16	22	19	46	40	22	31	33	26	25	28	32	35	22	36	24	31	20	45	36	46	30	17	44	54
1064-66 Mission	Adult	256																																																																						
10th and Mission	Family	44	7	8	6	9	13	23	13	20	15	25	27	12	16	13	7	11	15	10	17	8	8	12	11	9	18	15	9	12	11	14	16	8	11	3	13	16	15	13	12	12	16	12	16	13	18	20	18	15	18	20	24	19	13	17	20	12	9	12	6	5	11	13	12	15	9	8
1100 Ocean Ave	Mixed	25																							1							1																																					
1178 Folsom	Adult	41																																																																		
1180 4TH ST	Adult	50	15	14	16	12	17	17	11	13	10	14	6	11	23	13	10	4	11	13	12	7	16	10	20	12	17	18	25	18	15	15	14	9	14	8	8	11	10	22	15	13	12	8	21	18	14	15	16	30	21	13	11	12	13	18	24	17	12	10	11	11	8	9																		

| | | |

POLICE CALLS

PSH Site	Population	Current unit count (or max unit ct if closed)	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020	Jun 2020	Jul 2020	Aug 2020	Sep 2020	Oct 2020	Nov 2020	Dec 2020	Jan 2021	Feb 2021	Mar 2021	Apr 2021	May 2021	Jun 2021	Jul 2021	Aug 2021	Sep 2021	Oct 2021	Nov 2021	Dec 2021	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022	Dec 2022	Jan 2023	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023	Jan 2024	Feb 2024	Mar 2024	Apr 2024	May 2024	Jun 2024	Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Sep 2024	Oct 2024	Nov 2024	Dec 2024	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mar 2025	Apr 2025	May 2025	Jun 2025
1036 Mission	Family	40	15	19	25	9	10	12	6	12	20	11	20	15	5	9	11	11	24	26	8	25	15	11	10	13	19	13	15	12	8	13	12	10	15	10	12	9	9	6	7	8	12	10	15	12	40	33	18	25	24	21	22	24	24	29	18	26	22	25	15	36	31	43	24	14	43	47
1064-66 Mission	Adult	256																																																																
10th and Mission	Family	44	5	3	3	6	9	19	9	12	12	21	10	8	8	2	7	6	8	4	3	1	6	4	5	14	11	2	6	7	6	8	5	1	2	5	7	8	5	7	6	12	9	11	10	14	12	13	6	13	15	15	14	10	11	14	5	5	4	3	1	8	8	11	11	5	3
1100 Ocean Ave	Mixed	25																							1						1																																		
1178 Folsom	Adult	41																																																														
1180 4TH ST	Family	50	11	10	6	5	13	14	8	7	7	1	3	8	4	2	1	3	4	5	1	3		9	9	8	5	15	7	6	6	4	5	12	3	4	6	6	17	7	9	5	3	3	9	4	5	9	8	19	11	9	6	3	4	5	5	9	10	4	7	4	3	7	7	6	5
1296 Shotwell	Adult	22	1	2	2	6	5	8	5	9	4	3	4	5	5	24	29	33	27	24	17	23	31	3	25	13	3	27	6	10	15	17	12	12	10	13	12	5	5	8	15	13	6	16	5	4	6	7	6	10	3	5	1	3	3	2	5	5	1	3	3	2	2	5	5	4
149 Mason	Adult	55	2	7	7	5	10	16	20	31	15	13	11	1	5	7	2	5	4	2	6	7	9	9	2	4	5	9	7	2	4	2	5	5	5	6	3	6	8	1	1	8	13	3	3	6	2	8	17	8	6	6	5	5	5	15	3	7	7	1	1	4	2	5	5	4
180 Jones	Adult	35																																																															
1950 Mission	Family	47		1				2	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	13	13	10	7	8	10	20	9	13	15	9	15	18	17	20	13	20	18	32	12	11	30	20	4	21	11	11	9	10	23	24	12	13	10	15	5	14	24	12	6	13	12	18	20	18	16	17	13	31	37	25	24
270 Turk	Adult	30								3	4	3	3	4	2	7	8	6	1		3		4	2	3	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	1	4	3	12	4	3	2	9	1	1		3	3	5	2	1	2	4	1	4	2	1	5	12	2	4	6	13	2	1	6	2	4
321 Turk	Adult	4	1	1			2		1	1									1	1					1	2														2		1	1					1																
383 6th Avenue	Adult	40																																																												
455 Fell Street	Family	33	10	3	8	15	7	6	6	11	6	12	3	5	12	3	8	9	15	20	11	13	17	15	10	10	15	7	14	11	3	15	8	4	10	10	5	7	4	4	10	9	5	8	6	8	7	12	12	9	5	8	5	22	20	22	13	6	6	8	12	5	24	9	8	15	17
5th Street Apartments	Adult	6	3	10	5	2	6	7	4	7	4	4	2	1	8	7	6	2	9	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	6	3	2	2	2	5	3	1	2	2	5	3	1	2	5	1	3	1	5	1	1	2	7	2	3	4																	
600 7th Street	Mixed	120																																																													
626 Mission Bay	Mixed	29	4	7	8	8	15	15	18	22	25	7	10	16	14	6	8	10	9	25	20	19	26	25	20	25	13	18	11	6	22	14	13	13	14	9	16	16	15	15	23	30	26	24	40	12	14	11	21	17	19	13	18	13	22	26	19	22	12	17	24	7	8	6	5	4	5	9
681 Florida	Family	39																																																													
735 Davis Senior	Adult	15									2					2				2		1	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	3		2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
835 Turk	Adult	90																													6	12	14	10	6	9	15	4	14	14	11	4	5	8	6	4	10	6	11	10	9	19	15	7	14	18	12	8	15	13	8	19	28	32	14	8
95 Laguna Senior Housing	Adult	15	5	5	2	2	5	4	4	6	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	3		3	1	1	5	3	3		3	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	17	7	6	2	2	5	2	13	3	1	1	2	3	3	6	2	3	3	10	3	8	2	1
990 Polk	Adult	50	3	4	8	5	8	4	3	5	2	19	16	11	6	8	6	5	3	5	14	6	10	9	13	7	6	4	5	6	13	7	6	7	12	7	4	4	5	3	4	7	15	4	2	2	2	4	2	9	8	3	7	2	2	6	8	4	5	11	4	3	4	2	2	4
Aarti Hotel	Adult	36	9	3	7	8	3	3	1	3	8	5	2	2	3	2	1	3	6	3	3	3	4	2	1	6	3	1	1	1	2	1	4	7	5	3	1	1	1	2	4	1	3	2	4	1	3	4	3	2	1	1	2	2	3	3		1	4	4	1	1		
Abigail Hotel	Adult	59	7		2		3	3	1	2		3	2	2	1	1	2		1	2		1	2		2	3	3	3	3	7	7	1	2	8	17	7	4	9	4	1	9	6	6	8	4	6	6	4	4	3	4	4	2	6	7	5	5	2	5	1	2	2	3
Alder Hotel	Adult	116	1	8	5	19	13	13	26	19	16	11	16	17	26	14	2	7	13	14	20	7	11	13	6	8	12	10	16	18	5	10	11	8	6	20	14	4	13	27	23	16	10	11	6	5	7	13	12	15	12	6	11	18	18	20	5	12	8	18	8	5	35	18	13
All Star Hotel	Adult	75	8	4	23	11	20	14	26	12	7	23	17	10	19	20	18	6	4	8	12	11	14	6	9	13	3	12	5	6	13	10	11	6	13	50	14	15	18	7	6	8	10	16	8	14	5	5	4	11	8	16	16	10	9	23	21	5	4	6	9	3	5	8	7	10	6	8
Allen Hotel	Adult	61	4	2	8	4	7	7	6	8	10	15	11	13	3	7	4	6	2	4	1	5	7	3	3	5	5	1	4	3	3	1	4	5	2	1	1	6	2	3	7	4	3	4	5	5	4	6	9	3	5	8	1	2	2	10	4	4	3	11	13	16	13
Altamont Hotel	Adult	88	10	9	12	7	16	22	9	7	9	10	6	9	6	5	6	3	5	9	10	10	12	6	13	8	9	5	9	11	7	14	9	3	6	4	13	27	23	16	10	11	6	5	3	7	1	10	12	1	3	3	3	8	12	11	10	9	8	9	11	8	15	12	3	11	13	16	13
Ambassador Hotel	Adult	28	35	28	21	13	6	18	17	6	17	14	25	12	21	18	14	14	9	18	19	17	16	29	24	11	9	18	12	8	10	20	24	15	11	6	10	19	12	8	12	13	12	7	13	17	18	29	14	21	30	20	20	22	18	21	21	20	17	18	20	21	22	16	21	17	28	22	18	10	8	13
Apollo Hotel	Adult	80	4	1	5	12	14	11	17	10	7	6	5	4	8	3	9	11	7	4	7	5	7	6	7	4	9	14	7	5	3	7	8	4	14	10	9	2	7	3	8	2	7	5	3	8	2	1	5	12	2	3	4	3	1	3	4	4	4	3	11	10	8
Aranda Hotel	Adult	110	20	7	10	9	21	17	12	12	4	6	12	11	7	8	9	2	5	8	6	6	8	11	7	7	6	9	16	18	38	14	10	20	27	48	11	6	21	20	21	15	26	30	28	20	9	15	20	23	22	9	10	6	7	14	22	9	16	9	21	11	15	13	19	22	6	25
Arlington Residence	Adult	136	21	17	29	36	49	46	50	50	49	54	34	39	54	37	36	29	24	11	9	18	12	24	8	10	20	16	10	11	19	21	20	9	13	16	22	27	34	26	29	26	12	16	20	16	11	13	17	16	15	25	16	18	20	19	19	17	18	21	20	17	11	20	26	
Armstrong Place Senior Housing	Adult	23	6	3	1	5	12	3	2	1		2	4	2	1		1	1	3		1	2	2	1	1	3	1	5	2	6	3	2	4	2	3	4	1	2	3	2	9	5		6	1		3	1	1	3		1	1	1	3		1	1		1	2	2	
Arnett Watson Apartments	Mixed	83	9	10	12	10	12	6	14	9	7	14	7	7	17	9	11	5	22	32	20	17	16	17	8	15	25	17	6	8	8	5	12	16	9	12	15	11	8	10	18	11	9	6	4	20	9	13	11	24	4	13	3	10	19	14	9	6	9	7	9	7	
Artmar Hotel	Adult	53																														1	1	1	2	5	8	4	5	2	4	4	3	5	5	10	9	8	1	3	4	3	6	1	3	4	3	8	6	5	8	3	2	6	6	3	3	10	4	6	15
Auburn Hotel	Adult	67	29	31	20	19	25	26	16	28	44	27	28	20	25	34	23	27	25	19	17	31	22	28	23	24	37	21	35	15	26	20	37	29	17	15	13	21	17	16	15	10	16	8	20	12	23	8	27	31	22	22	26	19	17	23	38	35	24	22	28	31	43	29	20	21	22	28
Baldwin	Adult	122	12	19	13	13	25	10	16	16	5	11	14	12	6	3	9	13	25	15	16	10	12	11	11	12	12	7	7	6	5	9	13	25	15	16	10	12	11	11	12	7	6	5	4	13	9	12	15	11	9	13	5	15	16	11	6	5	6	3	10	4	6	15	
Bayanihan House	Adult	9	18	18	16	21	18	16	18	22	11	13	20	15	10	17	20	12	22	7	18	23	17	7	12	10	9	11	14	13	9	13	21	12	15	11	13	11	13	11	19	14	29	19	29	20	21	13	32	20	7	20	28	22	12	16	14	17	14	13	8	
Bayview Hill Gardens	Mixed	72	5	8	8	3	6	4	6	8	17	9	12	24	8	10	6	6	11	14	9	9	15	12	14	17	8	8	10	8	7	9	7	5	14	2	3	3	6	5	7	8	2	3	6	4	7	12	4	7		6	8	
Bishop Swing Community House	Adult	134	13	11	21	4	13	10	14	19	12	15	21	16	23	12	15	7	16	23	9	4	5	9	12	9	4	8	10	8	12	11	18	9	4	16	21	18	27	15	13	6	6	4	5	5	6	4	7	3	6	5	5	8	12	3	5	7	16	5	12	3	5	7	16	
Boyd Hotel	Adult	75	6	4	6	13	10	9	8	16	14	6	4	13	9	13	10	14	18	14	16	11	6	4	13	15	16	7	6	12	15	2	7	18	18	7	8	10	9	3	2	5	3	1	4	2	1	6	2	1	5	6	15	18	29	13	12	13	12	9	16	20	
Bristol Hotel	Adult	57	9	9	3	7	9	3	7	11	4	1	4	6	3	1	4	6	8	3	4	10	15	3	6	1	2	1	8	2	3	1	5	4	4	4	2	3	1	3	5	3	3	6	1	2	1	7	13	16	15	4	1	4	4	5	11	9	1	3	
Broadway Sansome Apartments	Mixed	37	3	3	1	2	5	1	5	2	6	1	8	1	1	1	6	8	3	4	4	13	7	2	5	2	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	13	4	3	4	6	2	4	2	9	3	3	3	4	6	2	4	1	5	5	9	8	1	6	3	8	12	6	2	5		
Cadillac Hotel	Adult	122	10	10	3	14	13	10	18	16	14	21	7	12	14	12	11	12	13	13	18	17	21	11	12	22	9	18	11	17	11	12	9	6	7	13	6	9	9	4	11	7	8	5	3	9	7	11	45	38	32	55	38	27	32	25	32	26	33	22	31	30	23	24	30	14	21	6	15	24	11	7	
Caldicke Arms Hotel	Adult	44		1		1		1						1	1		1	5	4	4	3			1	1	2	5	3			1	1	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	6	7	2	5	5	3	8	4	13	9	12	5	4	2	1	3	3	6	5	8	4	3	10	4	6	15	
Cambridge	Adult	60	15	25	17	23	30	16	22	28	13	27	25	26	28	28	29	30	21	24	29	16	36	29	32	31	33	40	38	34	42	20	53	29	31	33	39	45	45	37	44	35	30	29	45	38	32	55	38	27	32	25	32	26	33	22	31	30	23	24	30	14	21	6	15	8	35	18	
Camelot Hotel	Adult	54	3	3	3	2	4	1	5	4	6	1	3	1	3	5	4	2	3	10	11	16	13	13	8	9	4	5	5	9	4	1	3	11	7	2	5	7	4	6	7	4	3	2	1	1	4	5	10	19	10	12	9	16	5	3	5	6	3	10	4	4	8	5	10	9
Canon Barcus Community House	Family	15	6	5	6	3	3	2	8	4	5	3	4	3	6	4	6	4	2	4	3	13	11	11	5	4	6	10	1	5	7	2	5	5	3	5	2	4	4	3	3	2	1	1	3	5	2	1	5	4	8	11	5	2	1	6	6	1	5	3	4	4	8	5	10	9
Canon Kip Community House	Adult	103	8	11	11	17	9	16	17	18	14	17	16	11	47	34	29	17	24	33	31	16	24	10	26	29	20	20	13	18	18	18	9	17	7	4	21	12	9	10	25	11	17	24	31	25	28	30	6	12	14	8	18	10	10	10	9	9	12	10	13	9	
Casa Adelante	Mixed	29										1		1	1	3	10	14	15	12	17	18	14	17	13	14	21	13	22	14	4	15	9	7	9	8	9	10	9	10	5	13	4	2	10	9	14	13	8	5	10	10	9	9	7	3	16	6	7	5	8	7	8	10	8	
Casa Colibri	Adult	50																															1	7	1	1	1	4	1	4	3	3	1	2	4	1	5	1	1	4	3	3	1	2	4	3	7	2	1	7	4	4	7	2	7		
Casa de la Misión	Adult	44																			5	1	1	2	3	3	10	2	3	5	4	5	4	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	4			3	4	
Casa Esperanza	Adult	25											1																				1	1	1																											
Casa Quezada	Adult	52			1			1		3	5	2	3	1	5	7	1		1		1	1											1	3	3	2	3																								
Cecil Williams	Adult	22	4	3	8	1	4	3	7	8	6	6	5	5	3	1	8	8	3	12	2	5	4	1	12	10	5	6	5	3	8	6	4	10	3	5	1	1	1	2	4	2	8	2	2	5	4	16	28	20	10	3	2	9	7	1	2	3	2	5	6	1	8	9	3	3
City Gardens	Family	160																																																														
Civic Center Residence	Adult	102	15	24	43	46	43	21	22	17	27	17	29	42	29	15	18	23	24	32	24	16	31	49	46	29	40	49	47	53	45	23	26	25	32	43	13	18	25	24	18	27	20	19	21	26	17	26	19	22	19	23	20	18	24	28	19	15	24	10	26	14	16	24	31	14	17
Coronado Hotel	Adult	65	20	18	17	16	35	26	16	8	18	16	11	13	16	6	9	12	13	8	12	20	2	9	6	7	5	8	5	7	3	5	4	10	1	6	3	6	5	15	8	9	6	12	8	8	3	9	8	12	12	8	6	9	9	4	10	5	9	7	6	10	7	15	5	
Coronet Senior Housing	Adult	25	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	3	4	7	5	3	1	1	8	17	7	2	5	4	2	8	7	3	4	5	6	4	4	10	6	1	8	3	7	2	5	6	2	1	3	2	1	4	2	3	8	2	4	10	1	6	4	7	2	8	2	5	4	4	3	10	
Crosby Hotel	Adult	124	27	27	18	23	23	20	38	21	13	31	22	22	25	18	27	33	14	22	17	12	23	24	20	12	15	20	21	31	25	18	33	26	25	23	24	20	29	17	26	25	27	25	14	16	17	20	28	37	26	40	36	36	34	35	32	40	54	38	40	33	36	38
Crown Hotel	Adult	39	2	6	7	6	4	6	11	13	13	8	10	11	11	5	11	11	5	5	11	11	5	5	4	6	2	5	12	6	10	7	10	5	6	5	2	7	2	3	6	5	2	15	11	2	6	6	4	3	6	3	10	6	4	8	3	4	6	5	3	
Curran House	Family	10	8	1	2	4	2	8	4	6	4	1	4	5	1	1	2	4	1	2	3	3	1	5	6	4	2	2	5	5	4	8	5	3	2	4	2	5	2	1	1	3	1	7	4	3	4	3	2	1	5	6	3	3	
Curry Senior Center	Adult	14																																																												
Dahl Hotel	Adult	17	18	26	25	35	28	16	30	13	21	15	27	26	56	24	24	37	15	15	13	24	19	16	19	21	27	7	11	8	8	14	8	9	16	19	22	20	15	14	20	12	23	17	21	28	21	21	22	14	24	23	12	30	12	18	21	18	22	14	17	20	25	20	13	23	22	21	39
Diva Hotel	Adult	121																																																													
Dr. Davis Senior Community	Adult	23	11	12	4	12	2	4	9	11	2	7	12	4	5	3	8	4	6	2	9	14	11	7	5	6	5	6	2	7	7	4	5	6	3	6	4	3	4	4	13	7	6	10	6	5	9	4	4	4	2	4	6	4	6	4	1	4	3	3	2	5	6	4	9
Dudley Apartments	Adult	19	14	8	7	7	12	10	7	12	10	12	14	22	8	8	5	11	7	10	8	10	10	5	9	10	5	6	4	7	4	10	10	6	9	11	8	7	12	9	5	8	6	9	4	5	6	4	8	5	2	6	3	7	4	2	9	8	2	2	
Eddy and Taylor	Family	30																																																													
Eddy Street Apartments	Adult	15

| | | |

EMS CALLS

PSH Site	Population	Current unit count (or max unit ct if closed)	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020	Jun 2020	Jul 2020	Aug 2020	Sep 2020	Oct 2020	Nov 2020	Dec 2020	Jan 2021	Feb 2021	Mar 2021	Apr 2021	May 2021	Jun 2021	Jul 2021	Aug 2021	Sep 2021	Oct 2021	Nov 2021	Dec 2021	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022	Dec 2022	Jan 2023	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023	Jan 2024	Feb 2024	Mar 2024	Apr 2024	May 2024	Jun 2024	Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Sep 2024	Oct 2024	Nov 2024	Dec 2024	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mar 2025	Apr 2025	May 2025	Jun 2025
1036 Mission	Family	40	5	5	7	7	4	3			3	4	5	6	3	3	3	3	3	8	4	2	5	5	1	3	3	6	1	4	5	4	2	6	2	3	6	3	6	7	2	2	9	7	4	6	5	3	7	3	7	8	5	3	4	5	10	4	10	2	5	6	6	4	5	5	5	2	5
1064-66 Mission	Adult	256																														3	16	18	34	37	31	33	31	22	32	17	26	23	21	28	21	27	24	24	26	31	20	28	27	27	38	25	21	14	17	27	18	12
10th and Mission	Family	44	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	7	6	6	6	10	5	5	5	9	4	13	5	7	6	6	3	6	5	5	7	4	8	6	5	8	2	7	7	6	6	6	3	3	3	8	4	7	7	4	7	3	6	6	4	4	3	7	3	3	5	1	4	5	4
1100 Ocean Ave	Mixed	25																																																																			
1178 Folsom	Adult	41																																																																	
1180 4TH ST	Family	50	6	5	10	8	4	3	2	6	3	7	5	8	17	9	8	3	9	9	7	6	13	9	11	5	7	12	11	12	9	9	11	4	3	3	5	5	4	6	9	2	7	5	18	7	8	6	7	7	10	6	13	12	5	8	10	9	2	5	3	2	4
1296 Shotwell	Adult	22		1		1	5	2	7	3	7	2	3	3	5	7	1	4	9	9	4	1	7	8	3	4	4	6	5	3	7	4	4	4	3	5	3	4	5	2	3	8	5	1	7	9	6	4	6	6	4	3	8	7	2	5	4	3	8	7	5	4	3	1	6	3	5
149 Mason	Adult	55	11	5	9	3	5	9	12	5	2	8	4	5	10	5	7	4	4	5	3	8	6	5	2	3	6	6	4	6	5	3	6	8	8	5	14	8	6	4	6	5	9	6	9	6	8	14	18	14	20	9	12	8	6	4	9	16	4	9	10	8	4	5	10	9	8	12	11
180 Jones	Adult	35																																1																			1		2	4	3	5	6	9	3	8	4	7	7	1	4	6	1	4	
1950 Mission	Family	40		1									4	4	3	5	6	2	3	5	6	7	10	2	10	2	3	5	5	9	5	8	5	4	5	10	5	3	7	6	6	7	4	15	12	5	9	4	8	5	10	10	4	2	5	10	7	7	8	7	3	6	14	7	10	18	
270 Turk	Adult	30											1	2	8	1	1	3	6	5	4	5	2	4	5	7	2	1	3	6	7	7	1	4	2	4	4	8	6	2	5	4	5	3	2	2	6	12	6	10	5	6	9	8	14	6	10	4	2										
321 Turk	Adult	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	1				1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	1			1						1	1	2	1	2	1		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	5		3									
383 6th Avenue	Adult	40																																																																	
455 Fell Street	Family	33	1	5	5	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	5	1	4	2	2	2		5	3	2	3	3	6	2	1	6	1	5	6	2	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	3		3	9	2			2	3	1	1	2	2	4	4	3	7	3	4		3	1	4	3	2
5th Street Aaartments	Adult	6	4	2	2	1	4	4	2	3	2	2	1	2		5	3		5		4	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	1		3	2	5	3	1	2	2		1	4	2	2		1	3	7	4	2	2	1		1	2	3	3	2		3	3									
600 7th Street	Mixed	120																																																																	
626 Mission Bay	Mixed	29	7	5	2	1	2	4	4	8	10	6	4	7	3	1	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	5	3	7	2	8	4	2			4	3	3	3	6	5	9	4	4	6	4	7	7	13	8	7	13	12	6	10	3	3	4	5	3	2	5	6	4	8	7	4	7	5	
681 Florida	Family	39																																																																
735 Davis Senior	Adult	15																																																														
835 Turk	Adult	90																																																														
95 Laguna Senior Housing	Adult	15	5	2	7	8	3	1	4	5	5	5	6	5	2	3	2	5	2	3	4	1		2	2	4	4	7	7	5	9	4	8	5	4	6	3	2	2	5	1	1	2	4	5	3	3	5	5	6	3	2	2	1	3	3	6	6	6	3	3	2	
990 Polk	Adult	50	8	6	9	10	8	16	11	8	6	12	10	12	6	10	5	2	5	8	8	6	4	3	7	5	1	5	2	6	6	6	4	2	14	3	0	4	4	3	4	5	11	6	7	3	10	3	5	7	15	12	9	12	15	13	12	6	11	14	10	20	12	20	18	30	16	8	3	7	10	10
Aarti Hotel	Adult	36	1	2	1	2		2		2		1		4	1	1		1	2	4	1			2	3	5						1	1		1	3	3	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	1																							
Abigail Hotel	Adult	59																																																																
Alder Hotel	Adult	116	4	6	1	10	7	4	10	11	12	9	11	19	9	10	8	7	10	9	9	5	3	3	8	6	9	12	13	5	1	3	20	19	9	5	5	21	9	10	5	6	3	7	4	10	12	11	8	10	6	7	7	5	5	8	8	16	4	10	15	12	12	16	8	8	
All Star Hotel	Adult	75	7	3	8	4	6	3	5	4	6	4	6	1	3	2	2	4	6	3	4	3	5	1	6	10	8	6	3	6	6	9	8	6	6	9	6	6	11	8	10	6	7	5	7	11	3	4	5	4	5	12	12	3	10	3	4	4	5	5	1	2	1	3	
Allen Hotel	Adult	61	2	1	7	7	2	2	5	10	10	9	7	2	3	4	5	3	4	6	1	8	4	8	8	6	10	3	1	6	1	1	11	1	1	3	1	6	4	4	5	8	5	1	7	3	5	7	5	6	3	13	7	7	3	2	3	6	3	2	1	6	3	5
Altamont Hotel	Adult	88	8	9	13	10	5	6	4	5	4	2	4	4	5	10	4	5	4	3	6	6	4	1	5	9	13	7	4	4	4	2	4	4	7	2	5	4	8	12	9	6	5	5	8	4	3	8	13	9	3	5	14	10	11	4	7	7	6	5	5	
Ambassador Hotel	Adult	59	13	11	13	6	14	22	10	13	11	20	15	16	11	7	8	3	8	10	10	7	9	5	5	14	7	17	8	9	6	4	3	9	7	5	4	6	5	7	9	3	11	7	8	10	10	6	7	15	11	9	5	13	15	17	17	14	10								
Aoollo Hotel	Adult	80	3	4	6	1	3	2	5	2	7	6	8	7	4	7	3	6	8	7	9	5	5	14	7	17	8	9	6	5	2	5	3	4	4	3	10	4	5	8	7	5	7	5	5	3	3	3	2	8													
Aranda Hotel	Adult	110	10	10	13	12	8	8	10	13	5	2	4	4	3	4	7	3	6	6	1	3	1	4	4	2	5	7	5	11	8	7	5	12	20	20	2	17	4	12	3	4	10	5	6	12	6	4	11	3	6	8	8	3	4	4	6	5	12	7	7	7				
Arlington Residence	Adult	136	15	10	30	27	33	31	32	26	24	28	36	26	33	42	35	45	41	43	33	37	36	34	36	50	39	20	15	14	14	18	15	21	12	20	25	23	24	26	26	30	25	20	25	22	15	25	13	18	24	21	30	23	17	12	14	11	16	12	21	13	25	27	19	12	14	16	
Armstrong Place Senior Housing	Adult	23	11	9	3	4	5	6	3	3	4	3	7	8	5	4	4	5	4	13	1	6	6	5	6	9	4	1	7	6	10	8	3	4	7	2	1	1	9	4	1	3	9	7	6	9	3	7	17	2	5	4	6	4	4	5	3	3	1	3	11	4	11	8	9	9	
Arnett Watson Apartments	Mixed	83	3	1	11	2	5	1	3	5	2	8	4	4	4	3	5	1	6	8	11	2	1	3	10	4	4	4	6	1	6	4	4	13	9	3	2	9	7	5	4	8	6	9	5	4	5	9	1	4	1	3	3	5	3	2	7	3	5	3	5	3	
Artmar Hotel	Adult	53																																																															
Auburn Hotel	Adult	67	14	5	5	10	5	8	7	4	7	10	5	8	2	12	4	7	2	4	5	5	4	8	4	6	14	4	8	4	7	3	12	4	4	6	17	10	13	7	12	11	5	7	12	7	9	3	8	3	6	8	10	4	8	15	8	13	6	8	5	15	8	7	10	6	10	10	10	
Baldwin	Adult	122	8	10	6	9	18	14	10	13	4	7	8	9	10	6	5	9	12	12	9	14	8	12	7	10	9	11	6	5	10	3	4	13	9	8	5	6	8	12	12	14	10	8	9	5	6	9	10	6	7	8	3	9	6	9	12								
Bayanihan House	Adult	9	13	13	19	24	29	12	14	19	13	12	13	15	10	6	5	9	14	18	21	23	20	13	15	12	15	10	16	14	11	9	13	16	17	21	18	14	11	14	10	18	11	8	17	18	21	28	21	6	14	19	14	12	9	16	12	11	12	9	5	13	14	12	20	14	6	17	11	11
Bayview Hill Gardens	Mixed	72	3	3	7	4	4	6	4	9	12	4	5	5	6	5	3	2	7	10	6	6	9	5	8	7	6	5	1	3	5	5	8	3	2	3	4	9	4	1	3	4	5	2	5	4	6	5	2	3	2	5	2	8	3	2	7	3	5	8	3	4	1	4	1
Bishop Swiss Community House	Adult	134	9	11	9	7	10	13	13	9	14	6	10	7	7	2	3	4	7	7	8	9	10	6	13	5	16	10	11	2	10	2	7	7	6	4	8	4	10	9	7	4	12	12	17	9	9	11	7	9	8	14	17	16	9	5	4	5	11						
Boyd Hotel	Adult	75	2	4	2	7	4	7	4	3	2	5	16	5	3	2	3	7	5	3	7	2	2	3	6	9	7	4	13	6	12	8	6	15	6	3	5	8	4	8	7	5	7	11	4	5	6	8	9	8	10	6	12	7	5	5	3	2	6	15	10	6	9	10	7	8	4	
Bristol Hotel	Adult	57	3	1	2		2		2	2	1	1	1	3	1		2		1	3	4	2		1	1	1	1	6	2	1		1	1	1	1	2	4	3	1	7	4	1	5		6	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	4	2	3	5	3		5	1	3	2	6	4	3	1				
Brisdelwy Sansome Apartments	Mixed	37	2		1	1		2		1	2		1							2			1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4		3	5	1	2	1	1	4	2	3	1	1	2	1	4	3	5	5										
Cadillac Hotel	Adult	122	7	10	3	6	8	15	8	11	12	11	21	2	18	8	9	8	6	10	6	8	6	7	8	7	7	9	10	5	7	8	11	9	13	8	13	17	5	8	11	14	14	9	10	10	15	11	9	12	7	20	21	14	10	14	11	15	26	9	17	20	14	21	12	12	11
Caldrake Arms Hotel	Adult	44							1									4	2	2	2	1				1	1	5	3		1	3	5	6	8	2		2	3	1	1	5	1	4	2	2	3	1	1	5	1	4	2	6	5	3	18								
Cambridge	Adult	60	12	2	14	10	8	4	5	7	8	11	9	4	6	5	6	12	9	12	11	18	11	10	8	14	5	15	11	9	8	5	5	6	11	8	12	9	8	5	12	9	13	16	4	6	9	10	6	7	8	3	10	4	6	9	12							
Camelot Hotel	Adult	54	2	2	1	9	4	2	3	4	2	2	1	4	1	1	6	4	2	8	8	2	10	5	3	10	8	2	1	5	10	6	4	2	5	3	1	2	6	4	2	6	4	1	4	2	1	1	7	2	1	7	5	9	5	13	20	13	7	10	10	1	7	1	5	4	
Canon Barcus Community House	Family	15	2			3	2	1	2	1		3	1																																																								
Canon Kip Community House	Adult	103	12	10	12	29	12	9	29	11	13	10	10	17	9	17	9	14	23	24	13	15	18	30	22	13	12	21	13	21	14	9	20	6	16	12	23	19	9	14	9	8	11	10	3	11	12	26	20	7	8	21	21	21	16	20	9	12	9	16	15	16	11	7	13	9	5
Casa Adelante	Mixed	29																																																															
Casa Colibri	Adult	50																																																													
Casa de la Misión	Adult	64																			1	5	2	8	6	7	8	5	7	1	11	7	9	13	4	2	10	6	4	3	2	5	3	1	3	4	2	1	5	4	1	2	3	4	7	6	4	1							
Casa Esperanza	Adult	25																																																													
Casa Quezada	Adult	52			1	36			1	3	2		1				1	1			2		1	1		1	2	1		1		2	1	3							2	1	2		1	1	3		1	1	2	3	1	1		1	2	1	1			
Cecil Williams	Adult	22	5	2	2	5	4	3	2	3	7	10	6	4	4	1	2	4	3	4	4	3	4	2	6	5	7	1	6	4	14	5	7	16	6	4	8	7	1	7	7	12	1	9	5	2	16	9	5	6	8	3	4	2	1	3	1	4	2	2	2	
City Gardens	Mixed	160																																																														
Civic Center Residence	Adult	102	14	10	22	7	20	12	14	8	14	20	18	20	19	19	9	11	9	12	12	14	13	16	6	16	11	16	17	12	17	14	9	20	19	25	10	14	15	25	19	23	17	10	12	19	18	19	20	17	24	28	29	13	21	22	22	30	23	13	11	15	23	27	16	21	24	12	12
Coronado Hotel	Adult	65	7	5	6	16	10	10	5	7	12	6	14	17	11	4	10	3	5	2	5	5	2	5	2	5	3	5	4	2	4	5	2	6	5	8	11	6	4	7	4	1	1	6	2	2	2	4	5	8	6	9	4	4	2	11	3	6	4	4	5	3	
Coronet Senior Housing	Adult	25	8	11	4	8	4	5	7	13	12	7	5	7	6	7	2	4	7	6	8	10	11	6	5	9	4	11	4	6	9	9	5	11	8	13	17	14	8	9	6	8	8	7	6	9	12	18	21	14	11	24	21	17	10	20	12	16	9	13	11	8	4	10	9	10	14	9	10	8	13
Crosby Hotel	Adult	124	24	13	17	17	17	18	16	22	11	23	18	13	16	9	4	9	9	7	11	2	11	4	9	3	4	3	11	5	14	10	5	17	14	9	9	10	14	6	10	13	15	15	10	13	4	9	16	10	12	20	34	20	14	19	10	15	5	19	11	22	21	15	17	14	18	8	
Crown Hotel	Adult	39	3	5	6	4	3	3	3	5		3	2	4	2	5	1	5	1	3	3	3	1	5	10	4	5	3	1	4	2	2	1	9	2	3	5	4	2	4	1	4	4	6	2	3	10	2	7	5	2	3	6	3	4	1	3	5	4	3	3					
Curran House	Adult	10	2	2	4		1	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	5	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	5	1	1	5	2	2	2	3	3	1	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	1	3	1	2	4	1	
Curry Senior Center	Adult	14	4	1	1	2	3	4	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dalt Hotel	Adult	17	15	17	16	9	12	16	13	15	20	15	11	16	36	20	16	17	22	14	7	14	19	16	26	19	19	7	15	9	20	10	4	8	9	19	12	14	11	24	25	14	13	18	18	13	11	11	3	14	19	12	25	8	9	11	8	16	13	7	9	17	16	15	19	19	7	25
Diva Hotel	Adult	41																																																													
Dr. Davis Senior Community	Adult	23	8	5	13	17	9	9	14	7	9	11	13	8	11	6	19	7	11	12	16	12	13	8	8	10	11	10	5	6	3	6	7	9	6	9	9	12	4	7	6	12	4	11	8	7	6	12	6	9	16	7	13	4	18	16	8	24	12	10				
Dudley Apartments	Adult	19	4	5	4	6	9	7	7	3	8	7	6	16	3	1	2	1	3	9	8	7	6	6	4	2	6	3	6	5	9	1	5	3	5	7	3	6	5	9	1	4	5	5	8	2	4	6	10	17	11	5	4	3	7	2							
Eddy and Taylor	Family	30																																																														
Eddy Street Apartments	Adult	15	1	3	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	3	17	10	1	5	5	5	1	1	2	2	5	5	5	1	1	2	4	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	4	4	1	1							
Edgeworth Hotel	Adult	36	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	1	4	2	5	2	2	1	5	2	2	6	6	4	4	1	3	6	4	5	1	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	6	1	2	3	3	1	4	2	2	3	3	9	4	8	2	2	4	1	4	5				
Edith Witt Senior Community	Adult	27	9	4	3	5	9	10	5	6	6	6	2	1	5	3	8	4	1	5	2	2	5	5	7	3	6	6	5	3	7	8	4	8	3	6	9	7	10	7	8	8	14	12	6	9	4	5	8	16	10	5	12	8	11	7	9	5	5	7	7	7

| | | |

TOTAL INCIDENTS

FIRE CALLS

PSH Site	Population	Current unit count (or max unit ct if closed)	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020	Jun 2020	Jul 2020	Aug 2020	Sep 2020	Oct 2020	Nov 2020	Dec 2020	Jan 2021	Feb 2021	Mar 2021	Apr 2021	May 2021	Jun 2021	Jul 2021	Aug 2021	Sep 2021	Oct 2021	Nov 2021	Dec 2021	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022	Dec 2022	Jan 2023	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023	Jan 2024	Feb 2024	Mar 2024	Apr 2024	May 2024	Jun 2024	Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Sep 2024	Oct 2024	Nov 2024	Dec 2024	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mar 2025	Apr 2025	May 2025	Jun 2025
1036 Mission	Family	40	2	1	1		3	1	1		1		3	1	2	4	1	1		1			2		1	1		2		3	1	3	3		1	1	4	2	1	2	3	2	2		3	1		1		3	1	1		3	2	3		1		3	1			2
1064-66 Mission	Adult	256																				1			1	1		1	5	4	5	2	4	6	5	8	9	4	17	10	6	4	5	8	3	5	8	10	14	6	8	6	2	6	6	2	8
1100 and Mission	Family	44		2			1	1	1	1		1		1			1			1			1	1	1			2		1	1	3		2		1	2		2			2	1	2	1	1		2			3	1	3		1	1		1	1	2				1
1100 Ocean Ave	Mixed	25																																																												
1178 Folsom	Adult	41																																																												
1180 4TH ST	Family	50							1				1											1	2		2	1																																				
1296 Shotwell	Adult	22			1			2	3	4	3	1	1	2		1	3	1	2		2	1	2		4	1	2		4		3	3	1	2	1		3		5	6	1	1		3	2	1	1	1	3	1		1		2	4	3	5	8					
149 Mason	Adult	55		1	1							1	1		1		2	1					3		2						2	1	2	2				1		1			3	5	1	1		1		1		1	1	1		1			4	2					
180 Jones	Adult	35																																																													
1950 Mission	Family	40								1	2						1			2		2	1		1		4		2	2	2			3	4	2	1	3	3	8	3	2	1		2	2	1	1	2	2	4	4	2	4	6	4	2	3	2	3	4			
270 Turk	Adult	30										1	1	1	4	1	1	2	1		1		1		1	5		1			2		3		1	2	3	2			2	1				1	1	1		1		4	2		1	1			2	
321 Turk	Adult	4														1					1															1																										1
383 6th Avenue	Adult	40																																																												
455 Fell Street	Family	33	2	2	1	3	2				2				1		1	2		1	1			1					2	2	1			1	1						1	3	3	1	1								5				1		1	1
5th Street Apartments	Adult	6		2			2			1					1	2	2							1	1		1					1				3							1	1	2		1	3	1	3	2											
600 7th Street	Mixed	120																																																											
626 Mission Bay	Mixed	29								1	3									2					1		2	1	1										1		1							1															
681 Florida	Family	39																									1					1																													
735 Davis Senior	Adult	15											2	2			1		3	6	2	6	7	2		1			1				1	1		1	1				1	2	2		2	2															3	2
835 Turk	Adult	90																								1			1																																		
95 Laguna Senior Housing	Adult	15	1					1	1	2		1	1		1	4	2	2		1	1	2			1		2	1		1	1	1		1	1		1				3	2		1		1																	
990 Polk	Adult	50		1	1		2	2			2	3	1	1	4	2	1			4				1	5	1	2		1				1			2		1	3	1	1	1	1	5	3		6	6	2	3	2	3									
Aarti Hotel	Adult	36		1							1		2	1					1			1		1	5	1			2	2			1	1		2					1	1						2	1		1	2								1	2
Abigail Hotel	Adult	59			2				1																							1	4		1	1											1															
Alder Hotel	Adult	116	1	2	2		1	1	4		1	1		2			1		1			4			1	2	4	1	1	7	2	1	1	1	7	2	3	4	8	6	5	6	1	2	4		1	7	1	2	3	6	2	2	2	8	2	3	3	2	2	4	10	5	3	9	6	3	
All Star Hotel	Adult	75	2				3	1		4	4	3	1	1	2		1			1	3	2	2	1		1		2	3	4	1	5	1	4	5	4	1	1			1		5	1	1	1		1	4	7	2	2	2	3	2	5	5					
Allen Hotel	Adult	61			2			1			1	1	1			1		1	1	1	1		2	2	1		2					1	1					2	1	1								2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1				
Altamont Hotel	Adult	88		1	7	2	2	2	1			3	3	1	1		1	2	4	2	1	2	1	7	2		3	5		1	1	1	2	2		1	1	5		2	1	1	2	4	5		2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	4	2	6	1	2	1	4	2	7			
Ambassador Hotel	Adult	59	6	3	2	1	2	6		1		1	1	3	2	2	2	1		1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2		1	2	2	1	6	4	2	1	2	2	4	2	3	7	5	7	5	2	4	2	3	5	9	6	5	9	6	12	6	5	7	5	4	3	5	
Apollo Hotel	Adult	80	1	4		1	1		2	1	3	2	2		2	1	1	5	1	3	4	3		2	2	4	4		2	2	5	6	2	10	5	15	11	8	7	2	3	2	5	1	2	1	5	2	7	2	4	4	3	2	5	4	1	2	5	1	7	4	5	8	4	3
Aranda Hotel	Adult	110			1	1				1	1				1					2	1	1		1	1		1	2			1	1	2			1	6	6	1	2	1	4	2	3	2	5	7	7	2	3	4	1	2	1	3	6	2	1	4	2	7			
Arlington Residence	Adult	136	2	3	1	1	5	4	1	3	4	4	3	3	8	2	5	4	2	2	1	1	5	3	5	8	3	3	1	1	4	3	5	4	7	6	6	6	13	11	2	7	4	2	1	2	1	7	4	6	3	4	1	5	7	7	5	2	4	3	2	3	4
Armstrong Place Senior Housing	Adult	23	1		1		4			1		1	2				1				1	1			2		2	1			3	2	1		1	1		3		1	1		2		1	1																	
Arnett Watson Apartments	Mixed	83	2		3				1	3		1	1	1	2			2	2	1	1		1	1		2	1				3	1	1			2	2	2		1	2	1	1		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3		4	2	1	3			
Artmar Hotel	Adult	53																				1		3																			1	1							2													
Auburn Hotel	Adult	67	1	2	3	1	4			2	1				1	4	1	1	1	2	3				1	3	3	1	2	4	1			2	1	1	1	1		3		2	1		2	1				4	1		1	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	
Baldwin	Adult	122	1	5		5	3	5	3	2		2	2	4	4	1	4	1		4	1		1	2	1	2	4	2	1	1		1																														
Bayanihan House	Adult	9	4	5	2	1		2	1	6	1	1	1		2	4	6		3		1	2	1	1	4	1	1		3		1	1		2	1		2	2	3		1	2	1		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	
Bayview Hill Gardens	Mixed	72	1									8					1	2		1	1		1	2	1	2	1	1	1		1	1			2		2	1		1	1	1		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1			
Bishop Swing Community House	Adult	134	1	1	1	1	3	1		1	2		2	1	2	1	2	3	1	1		1	1	3	3		1	1		4	1	2	1	7	4	3	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1			5	5		2		1	2	1		2	1	1	2	3
Boyd Hotel	Adult	75					1	3		1		1	2				1	1		1			1			1		6	1	1	2		1			1	1	1	3	2	2	1	4	2	2	1	4	2	2	5	1	2	2	4	2	1	4	2	7	4	2	4	
Bristol Hotel	Adult	57	1																						1																																						
Broadway Sansome Apartments	Mixed	37						1												1												3			2			1	3																							
Cadillac Hotel	Adult	122	2			2	2				1	1	3				3		2	4	3			1	3	4	5			4	2	3	2		3	1	4	1	1	1	4	2	4	3	2	6	3	7	17	6	4	1	2	1	2	3	4	3		3	9	5	1				13
Caldrake Arms Hotel	Adult	44	1		2	2		3	1	1															1		2	3																																		1
Cambridge	Adult	60	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	3	5	2	1	2	3	2	1	4	1	3	4	3	7	5	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	5		1	1		4		4	3			1	5	4	6	2	3	2	4	1	2	4	5	5	7	5	3	16	8	4
Camelot Hotel	Adult	54	1														2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
Canon Barcus Community House	Family	15	1		2		1													1	1				2	2																																						
Canon Kip Community House	Adult	103	11	5	10	4	4	3	10	6	6	5	6	5	4	1	8	1	6	2	5	6	5	4	2	15	6	10	3	7	8	8	12	7	6	7	7	7	4		4	5	5	2	2	8	8	12	11	6	11	7	1	2	4	3	1	4	2	4	5	4	3	2	4	4	6	5
Casa Adelante	Mixed	29															1		2	3	1	2	1	1																																							
Casa Colibri	Adult	50																																																												
Casa de la Misión	Adult	44																		1	5	2	3	7	4	3	3		1		1	2	2	1	1	1		1	4	1			1																									
Casa Esperanza	Adult	25																																1																													
Casa Quezada	Adult	52										2	1																					1																											
Cecil Williams	Adult	22	1	1	1	1	2			2	1	1		1	1		2	1	3	4	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	7	7	1	2	3	5	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	3	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
City Gardens	Family	160																																																																
Civic Center Residence	Adult	102	3	5	3	2	2	3	2	7	6	10	4	4	4	1	3		1	3	3	2	6		2	5	1	5	3	5	1	2	2	4	4	16	5	5	7		5	6	6	11	7	2	7	4	11	12	11	12	5	3	5	4	23	10	13	8	15	7	13	10	4
Coronado Hotel	Adult	65			1	2	3	1	2			2						1		1	1																																											
Coronet Senior Housing	Adult	25	1		3	2	1	1	4	2	3		3	1	2	1			1	1	3				1		2	2	1	2	5	1		1	1	5	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	4	3	2	6	2	5	3	1								
Crosby Hotel	Adult	124	1	3	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	8	6	3		1			5		1	4		2	1	2	2		1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	7	2	1		1	1	7	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	5	4	7	3	6	3	5	4			
Crown Hotel	Adult	39	3		1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	2	1		2			5	3	1	2	3		5	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	4	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	4	2	1	1	7	
Curran House	Family	10			1						1			1		1	1	2		2	1		1		1	1	1	2		1		1	1																													
Curry Senior Center	Adult	14			1																																																										
Dalt Hotel	Adult	17	4	4		1	7	7	9	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	2	1	1	5	2	1	2		2	2	2	1	2	3		2	1	1	1	2	3	4	7	2	4	4			1	1	8	1	3	1	2	5	4	2	2	8	5	7	6	7	6	9	6	6
Diva Hotel	Adult	121																																																													
Dr. Davis Senior Community	Adult	23	2	4	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2		4	5	5	2	3	2	1	4	7	3	4	1		3	2	2	3	3		3	2	6	2	2	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
Dudley Apartments	Adult	19	2		1		2	1	2		3	1		1	1		1		1	1	6		1	2	1	4	1		2	1	3	2	3	2	4	4	2	2	3	1	1	1	4	6	2	1		1	4	2	1	1		2	2	2	2		1	1	
Eddy and Taylor	Family	30																																																													
Eddy Street Apartments	Adult	15	3			3				2			3	3	1	1						1	1	1	1	1	1					1	2	3		3		1	2	1	1	4	1		1	1	1	1	3	2		2								
Edgeworth Hotel	Adult	36		1						1								1																																												
Edith Witt Senior Community	Adult	27	2				1		1				2		3	2	2			1		1				2		2	2	1			2			2	1			1		3					1	1	2	1	1		4	1	1					
Edward II	Adult	24																												1																															
Edwin M. Lee	Adult	62																											1		2	1																														
El Dorado	Adult	10	2	2				2		2	1	1		2	2					2	4	1	3	4	2	2	4	3	1	2	1	1		1	3	4	4	4	2	7	1	3	4	1	1	4	4	1	3	2	4	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Elk Hotel	Adult	77		1	1		1	2	3						1	1	1							2	2							3		1					1	1				6	2		2	3	3	4	3	4	1		1		2	5	2	4	1	3	
Ellis Street Apartments	Adult	25		3	1		1		1	1		1			1					2			1					2																																			
Elm Hotel	Adult	80																																																													
Empress	Adult	89	1		1	3	3	2	1	4	6	2	2	3	8	3	3	4	8	4	3	2	5	6	2	5	3	6	6	2	3	4	3	9	3	3	9	6	5	2	4	9	2	8	1	2	2	6	2	5	3	8	5	14	6	7	7	10	3	7	9	5	8	5	7	3	7	3	9
Essex Hotel	Adult	84				2	2				2	1		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2		1	2	4	5		2	1	1	2						1	5	5	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	7	2	2	2	
Fairfax Hotel	Adult	39	1										1							2				1	1		3		1		1																																
Felton Institute	Adult	52																																																											
Folsom/Dore	Adult	40		1		1	4	2	1	1	3	1		4	2	1	2			1	2			3	1	5	1							2	1	1	4		1		6	1	1	1	1	2	1		3	4	1	1	2	2							
Franciscan Towers	Mixed	70			3		1	1		2		2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1		1					1	1	1	2		1																														
Garland Hotel	Adult	69																						1																																						
Granada Hotel	Adult	175																																																												
Graystone Hotel	Adult	68				3			1												1	4		1	1						2		3	1	1																											
Hamlin Hotel	Adult	67	1	2	2		3	3		6	1	1		1	2					1	1	1	2	2	1	3	3	1	3	4	1	2	1	3	1	1	3	4	1	2	7	3	1	3	3	1	2	1	4	4	4	10	3	6	1	3	6	6	2	6	6	3	3	5
Hartland Hotel	Adult	130	5	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	2		1	7	4	6	1	2	1	5	1	1	4	2	1	2	3		2	2	1	4	7	7			3	4		6	1	3	1	5	9	7	4	1		1		1	3	2	1	3	7	3	2	3	1	3	5	3	3	3	5
Hazel Betsey	Mixed	9	3		1		1		2					3	2	2	3	1	1	2		2	2																																								
Henry Hotel	Adult	121	15	2	3	2	2	4		1		4	1	1	4		2	1	2	1	1	3		1	1	4	2	6	5	11	1	1	6	5	7	2	5	3	2		2	5	3	1	4	1	2	2	2	5	1	3	4	2	1	4	4	6	4	5	1	5	3	3	1	
Hillsdale Hotel	Adult	75	2	1	4	3	2	1	1	7		1	1		2		2							3	2	1	7		1	1				1	1	3		1	1	2	6		1	2	5	3	1	4	1	2	2	3								
HomeRise at Mission Bay	Adult	140																																																												
Hotel Isabel	Adult	20					1	1			1	1											1	1																																						
Iroquois Hotel	Adult	74	1	3	1	2	2		3		1	2	4	4	4	4	1	7	9	8	5	4	13	10	2	6	3	5	3	8	8	3	2	1	7	2	5	2	1	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	6	5	4	4	2	2	4	9	3	4	4	11	7	4	3	7	3	3	5
Island Bay Homes	Family	45																																																												
Jazzie Collins Apartments	Adult	96																																																											
Jefferson Hotel	Adult	103		2	3	1	1	17	1	1		1	7		1			1	2	1	1				1	3	2	1	1	2		2	1	1	2	4

TOTAL INCIDENTS

FIRE CALLS

| | | |

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Phone: (415) 554-5184
Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org

June 18, 2025

Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: MaryEllen.Carroll@sfgov.org

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director
Department of Homelessness and
Supportive Housing
440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Shireen.McSpadden@sfgov.org

Dear Executive Director Carroll and Executive Director McSpadden,

At the June 17, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Matt Dorsey issued the attached inquiry to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH).

Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests that DEM and HSH coordinate on a report that quantifies 911 calls for services, by month, at all site-based Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) addresses between January 1, 2020 and June 17, 2025. The report should offer a breakdown of 911 calls by police emergencies and medical emergencies, and include information identifying the contracted nonprofit operator and property manager for each site-based PSH location.

Please contact Madison Tam, Madison.R.Tam@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide for Supervisor Dorsey, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than July 2, 2025.

For questions pertaining to the administration of this inquiry, do not hesitate to contact me in the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184.

Very Truly Yours,

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/RL

Attachments:
- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Olivia Scanlon, DEM, Olivia.Scanlon@sfgov.org
Michelle Busse, DEM, Michelle.Busse@sfgov.org

Dylan Schneider, HSH, Dylan.Schneider@sfgov.org
Emily Cohen, HSH, Emily.Cohen@sfgov.org
Bridget Badasow, HSH, Bridget.Badasow@sfgov.org

Item 4

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Letter of Inquiry Response - Embarcadero Navigation Center
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:41:41 PM
Attachments:	7.02.2025_LOI Response_Embarcadero Navigation Center.pdf Outlook-knssvjxj.png CTA Clerk"s Memo Dorsey 052025.pdf

Hello,

Please see the attached joint response from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the Department of Public Health (DPH) to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the May 20, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:34 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>; Altman, Claire (DPH) <claire.altman@sfdph.org>; Hussey, Deirdre (DPH) <deirdre.hussey@sfdph.org>; Cohen, Emily

(HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Inquiry Response - Embarcadero Navigation Center

Good afternoon,

Attached please find attached the joint response from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and the Department of Public Health to Supervisor Dorsey's Letter of Inquiry regarding the Embarcadero Navigation Center.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (She/Hers)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
dylan.schneider@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Daniel Tsai, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Honorable Supervisor Matt Dorsey

Date: July 2, 2025

From: HSH Executive Director Shireen McSpadden and DPH Director Daniel Tsai

Subject: Letter of Inquiry Response – Embarcadero Navigation Center

---

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you for your Letter of Inquiry regarding the Embarcadero Navigation Center and the resources required to potentially convert it into a drug-free recovery-oriented pilot program, received on May 21, 2025. We appreciate your continued leadership and advocacy to ensure San Francisco has sufficient recovery-focused resources to support our most vulnerable residents.

We are committed to addressing the intertwined challenges of homelessness and addiction through the Mayor's Breaking the Cycle plan. Since its launch in April 2025, the plan has facilitated a significant expansion of recovery-focused services within the City's system of care for individuals experiencing homelessness, marking a pivotal shift in our approach to supporting those in need.

As we continue to enhance and scale recovery-oriented services, it is equally important to maintain a balanced and adaptable portfolio of care options. This approach ensures we are prepared to meet the diverse and evolving needs of individuals transitioning off the streets, providing the right support in the right setting at the right time. Our strategy aims to offer not only immediate relief but also a sustainable pathway to recovery, addressing both the urgent crisis and the underlying factors contributing to homelessness and addiction.

Our departments are working together closely to ensure that we have appropriate options to meet the needs on our streets. We continue to explore both new and existing sites to ensure programming, including recovery programming, can be successful and effective. Our response to your letter provides an overview on progress we have made in expanding recovery-oriented resources, additional information on the RESTORE program, and why the Embarcadero Navigation Center is not an appropriate site to consider for conversion to a drug-free recovery-oriented pilot program.

We look forward to continuing this discussion with you and your office. If you have any further questions, please contact Dylan Schneider, HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs at dylan.schneider@sfgov.org, or Claire Altman, DPH Acting Government Affairs Manager at claire.altman@sfdph.org, for questions on the RESTORE program.

Sincerely,

Shireen McSpadden
Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

Daniel Tsai
Department of Public Health

Recovery Housing in San Francisco

As part of Mayor Lurie's "Breaking the Cycle" plan, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the Department of Public Health (DPH) have worked together to expedite new interim housing services targeted at the right level of care, including recovery-focused and treatment interim housing beds for people at different stages of their journey from homelessness and addiction to long-term stability.

In April 2025, the Mayor announced the opening of ~279 recovery-focused interim housing beds (including an expansion in treatment beds). These new programs will fill gaps in the City's system of care with services that best meet the needs and acuity levels of people experiencing homelessness. These programs include:

- **James Baldwin Place**: 54 beds of sober transitional housing for adults experiencing homelessness
- **Sharon Hotel**: 60 beds of sober interim housing for adults experiencing homelessness
- **Kean Hotel**: 76 short-term (30-60 day) drug-free health respite beds for unhoused adults as their first step out of homelessness
- **Marina Inn**: 68 beds of post-treatment abstinence recovery housing to foster connection, accountability and independence
- **Harbor Light**: Expansion of 21 treatment beds to support with withdrawal management and a six-month residential program

RESTORE Program

RESTORE is a critical component of San Francisco's "Breaking the Cycle" plan—an innovative, results-driven intervention that rapidly connects people experiencing homelessness and opioid use disorder with immediate shelter, treatment, and intensive support.

Unlike traditional shelter models, RESTORE uniquely combines the offer of a non-congregate bed with a requirement to begin medication-assisted treatment (MOUD)—creating an immediate, structured pathway off the street and into care for individuals who are ready to engage. By embedding medical and behavioral health care within a shelter environment and offering 24/7 access, the program meets individuals at their point of readiness and supports them through stabilization and into recovery.

From March 2024 through February 2025, the RESTORE pilot program scaled to 35 beds at the Adante Hotel and served 340 unique individuals experiencing homelessness and opioid use disorder. Approximately 75% of clients who exited the program initiated medication-assisted treatment (MOUD) such as buprenorphine or methadone. Roughly half transitioned into residential treatment, withdrawal management, housing, or shelter.

These outcomes surpassed engagement rates typically seen in traditional treatment referral models. RESTORE's ability to combine non-congregate shelter onsite treatment, and intensive case management created a powerful and scalable model for stabilizing individuals and launching them into longer-term recovery.

Based on this success, the City plans to scale the RESTORE program to 73 beds at the Adante Hotel, including a daytime structured outpatient treatment component. Further expansion of the RESTORE program is included in the Mayor's Proposed budget with funding for operations and services across both HSH and DPH for approximately 120 beds at new or existing sites.

DPH, in partnership with HSH, is exploring additional sites to expand the RESTORE program. A core feature driving the program's success has been the provision of non-congregate rooms, which offer participants dignity, privacy, and a stable environment during the critical early stages of treatment and withdrawal. This model not only incentivizes individuals to come indoors but also enhances their likelihood of engaging in care. Another key element is the program's seamless connection between outreach and placement—allowing street teams to immediately accompany individuals from the point of engagement directly into a RESTORE facility, reducing people being lost during the drop-off process and increasing treatment initiation rates.

Based on programmatic requirements and site suitability criteria, the Embarcadero Navigation Center does not meet the operational needs for hosting a program similar to the RESTORE program.

Embarcadero Navigation Center

The Embarcadero Navigation Center (the "ENC"), operated by Five Keys Schools and Programs, serves as a vital part of the City's homelessness response system, providing shelter and essential services for up to 200 adults experiencing homelessness. The ENC has been a critical asset, contributing significantly to reducing unsheltered homelessness in the community. Between March 2019 and July 2023, the unsheltered population in the Outreach Zone dropped by 98%. The ENC has consistently maintained a high occupancy rate (99% as of June 2025), and it is one of the most widely used shelters in the City's temporary shelter portfolio.

However, when it comes to implementing the RESTORE program or other recovery-oriented models, the Embarcadero Navigation Center is not an ideal candidate.

- **Congregate Space**: The Embarcadero Navigation Center operates as a congregate shelter, with shared dormitories. This setup is not conducive to the needs of individuals in early recovery, who may be dealing with the severe physical symptoms of opioid withdrawal or the side effects of Medications for Opioid Use Disorder (MOUD). Non-congregate housing, which offers privacy and dignity, is crucial for individuals in the earliest stages of recovery.
- **Size and Capacity**: With its large capacity, the ENC is one of the largest shelter programs in the City, which poses challenges for implementing smaller, more intimate recovery housing models. The size of the program makes it ill-suited for the more tailored, personalized care required in recovery-oriented housing. For example, the Sharon Hotel—a pilot for sober interim housing—was selected precisely because it provides smaller, non-congregate quarters.
- **Temporary Nature of the Site**: The ENC operates on Port Property, a site slated for development. HSH continues to work closely with the Port to track development timelines, and we have committed to winding the program down in advance of the commencement of construction of the 714 units of housing proposed for the site, including 100 in a stand-alone affordable building. The current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between HSH and the Port includes an option to extend for up to two years beyond December 31, 2025, however we anticipate that development will begin prior to the full two-year term and 6-9 months will be needed to wind down the program.

- **Operational Considerations**: The complexity of converting the ENC to a recovery housing model would require a full wind-down the current operations, including finding alternative placements for all 199 guests currently on the site as of June 24, 2025. For a program of this size, up to 6 months. By the time the conversion was completed, we would likely have little to no time to operate the new program, meanwhile taking much-needed beds offline.

While this site may not be the right fit for a drug-free recovery-oriented program, we remain committed to finding solutions for those experiencing homelessness and addiction in the community. We are open to continuing conversations with Delancey Street and Supervisor Dorsey's office to explore alternative partnerships or the expansion of recovery-oriented facilities, such as those planned at other recovery sites opening in the area.

Thank you for your attention to these important considerations. We look forward to collaborating on further solutions to support those in need of recovery housing in San Francisco.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Phone: (415) 554-5184
Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org

May 21, 2025

Daniel Tsai, Director
Department of Public Health
101 Grove Street, Room 320
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Daniel.Tsai@sfdph.org

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Shireen.McSpadden@sfgov.org

Dear Director Tsai and Executive Director McSpadden,

At the May 20, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Matt Dorsey issued the attached inquiry to the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's specific request.

Please contact Dominca Donovan, Dominca.Donovan@sfgov.org, Chief of Staff to Supervisor Dorsey, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than June 4, 2025.

For questions pertaining to the administration of this inquiry, do not hesitate to contact me in the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184.

Very Truly Yours,

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/RL

Attachments:
- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Dr. Naveena Bobba, DPH, Naveena.Bobba@sfdph.org
Sneha Patil, DPH, Sneha.Patil@sfdph.org
Ana Validzic, DPH, Ana.Validzic@sfdph.org
Dylan Schneider, HSH, Dylan.Schneider@sfgov.org
Emily Cohen, HSH, Emily.Cohen@sfgov.org
Bridget Badasow, HSH, Bridget.Badasow@sfgov.org
Kunal Modi, MYR, Kunal.Modi@sfgov.org
Adam Thongsavat, MYR, Adam.Thongsavat@sfgov.org

Item 5

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Monthly memo on the status of abortion rights
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:20:08 AM
Attachments:	Monthly Memo on the Status of Abortion Rights June 2025.pdf Outlook-ginwk2lc.png

Hello,

Please see below and attached from the Department on the Status of Women (WOM), submitting a Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights for the month of June 2025.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Heitzenroder, Denise (HRC) <denise.heitzenroder@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 6:53 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>; Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRC) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>
Cc: ALARCON, MOLLY (CAT) <Molly.Alarcon@sfcityatty.org>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>; CLARK, JANA (CAT) <Jana.Clark@sfcityatty.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; Macaluso, Joseph (HRC) <joseph.macaluso@sfgov.org>; Negusse, Nina (MYR) <Nina.Negusse@sfgov.org>; Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; WILENSKY, JULIE (CAT) <Julie.Wilensky@sfcityatty.org>; Yip, Angela

(ADM) <angela.yip@sfgov.org>
Subject: Monthly memo on the status of abortion rights

Hello all,

On behalf of the Department on the Status of Women, please see the attached Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights Memorandum. Apologies this is a little later than usual.

Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions, and please stay on the lookout for details on upcoming BAARC programming. I look forward to supporting you around any questions or requests for additional information.

Best,
Denise

DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Denise Heitzenroder | Project Manager for Strategic Initiatives
She/her
San Francisco Dept. on the Status of Women
Engage. Educate. Empower.
p: 415-252-2576
w: dosw.org

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women

Mayor
Daniel Lurie

DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Date: July 2, 2025

To: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Members of the Board of Supervisors; City Attorney David Chiu; City Administrator Carmen Chu; Director of the Department of Public Health, Daniel Tsai; Acting Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission, Mawuli Tugbenyoh, and other interested stakeholders.

Cc: Molly Alarcon, Dr. Naveena Bobba, Jana Clark, Dr. Martin Escandon, Annie Gabillet, Phil Kim, Rebekah Krell, Charles Lutvak, Joseph Macaluso, Nina Negusse, Sneha Patil, Julie Wilensky and Angela Yip

Through: Linda Yeung, Acting Director/Department Head, Department on the Status of Women

From: Denise Heitzenroder, Project Manager for Strategic Initiatives, Department on the Status of Women

Subject: June 2025 Monthly Memo on the Status of Abortion Rights

The following update provides an overview of abortion laws in individual states, as well as local and statewide efforts to protect patients' access to reproductive healthcare. Our goal is to provide a monthly update that keeps the Mayor and other key internal stakeholders informed of developments in this new, ever-changing post-Dobbs landscape.

I. Current Snapshot of Abortion Access across the Nation

- A total of 19 states restrict abortion access, and 12 states now ban abortions. In November of 2024, voters passed abortion protections in seven states, ending bans in Arizona and Missouri. However, measures to enshrine abortion rights failed to pass in three states, and Nebraska voters passed a measure to uphold the state's abortion restrictions. Restrictions exist in seven states: Florida,

Georgia, Iowa and South Carolina have six-week abortion bans; Nebraska and North Carolina have bans at 12 weeks; and Utah has a ban after 18 weeks. Abortion bans are currently blocked in Montana and Wyoming while court cases progress. While some states with abortion bans have exceptions for certain scenarios, six states have no exceptions to protect the life of the pregnant person, eight have no exceptions for rape or incest and ten have no exceptions for lethal fetal anomalies.

- The Trump administration has revoked the guidance from the Biden Administration requiring hospitals that receive Medicare or Medicaid funding to provide emergency abortion care under Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA). The decision has resulted in conflicting and confusing guidance for patients and providers. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMMS), which provides oversight of hospitals, issued a statement saying they will enforce EMTALA including in "emergency medical conditions that place the health of a pregnant woman or her unborn child in serious jeopardy" and "will work to rectify any perceived legal confusion and instability." US Health and Human Services Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. then issued a letter stating that care would be provided, without specifying what care would include. Medical providers in states with abortion bans and restrictions have argued that Trump's decision has created more confusion around emergency care. The Attorney Generals of California, New York and New Jersey lead a coalition of 22 state Attorney Generals in a letter to the American Hospital Association reaffirming EMTALA's requirement to provide critical, "stabilizing abortion care to pregnant patients in emergency medical situations."

- The Guttmacher Institute released its Monthly Abortion Provision Study, analyzing policy shifts in the abortion care landscape and the movement of patients seeking abortion care. The full dashboard is available here. A few key findings from the report include:
    - Of all US abortion patients, 15 percent (or 155,000 patients) traveled out of their state to receive abortion care. This is a decrease from 2023, where 170,000 patients traveled out of state, but still nearly double the Pre-Dobbs baseline of 81,000 patients from 2020.
    - Approximately 28,000 Texans traveled for abortion care, to states as far as Maryland and Washington.
    - Patients in Florida, as well as surrounding states, were negatively impacted by the state's six-week ban. Patients

traveling outside of the state increased dramatically from 2023 to 2024. While only 120 and 210 patients traveled to Virginia and North Carolina in 2023, respectively, those numbers jumped to 1,620 and 1,320 in 2024.

- 51 abortion-related bills were enacted on the state-level in 2024. Analysis of the Pew Research Center's *2023-24 Religious Landscape Study* shows differences in abortion views by state, yet Americans overwhelmingly support access to abortion care: 63% say abortion should be legal in all or most cases. In 15 states, there is no significant difference between those who say abortion should be legal in most cases versus those that say it should be illegal. Arkansas is the only state where the balance of public opinion is against abortion by a statistically significant margin.

Balance of opinion on abortion, by state

States where more people say abortion should be ___ in all/most cases



Source: Religious Landscape Study of U.S. adults conducted July 17, 2023-March 4, 2024.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER

- The Government Accountability Office released a report examining the impact of the 2022 Dobbs decision. The GAO found "various adverse economic outcomes for women who are unable to obtain an abortion and instead carry pregnancies to term, including a lower rate of employment in the near term and higher levels of estimated financial distress." Overall, the analysis cited numerous negative impacts, ranging from increased maternal death rates in states with abortion bans to population declines. The report also looked at education attainment and found that abortion restrictions decreased the likelihood Black women would enter or complete college. However, the GAO noted that due to changes instituted by the Trump administration at the Center for Disease Control, which collects abortion data, "Officials were uncertain whether the resulting changes at the agency would affect future data collection efforts, including data on abortions."

- The latest #WeCount report from the Society of Family Planning shows that abortion rates were higher in 2024 than in 2023 or 2022. While the report found that telehealth abortions grew and in-person abortions declined slightly, the majority of abortions performed in the United States are still conducted in-person. "As telehealth has grown, the number of in-person abortions has not declined commensurately;" however, by December 2024, the report found that 1 in 4 abortions were provided by telehealth. The analysis also found that shield laws are critical to ensuring access to telehealth care, whether performed by a virtual clinic or a brick-and-mortar clinic: "Half of abortions provided via telehealth in 2024 were facilitated by shield laws."

- The Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) released a new report examining the costs associated with abortion bans or near bans in sixteen states. The report found that states with bans face massive economic losses, and women are forced out of the workforce, lowering GDPs. Combined, the report found that state level abortion restrictions cost the U.S. economy $133 billion. These losses are in line with prior reports showing young people moving out of states with bans or declining to move for a job to a state with bans.

- The National Bureau of Economic Research released a new report analyzing the impact of abortion bans and restrictions on intimate partner violence. The authors conclude that abortion bans

"significantly increased the rate of IPV for reproductive-aged women…on the order of about seven to 10 percent," resulting in $1.24 billion in social costs. Women between the ages of 25-34 and Black women saw the greatest increases in intimate partner violence in states with abortion bans.

- A new report in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) demonstrates the negative impact Texas' abortion ban has had on women's mental health. The article, authored by researchers from the University of Texas at San Antonio and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, among others, found that "Texas' abortion restrictions were associated with increases in mental distress among females of reproductive age, especially among younger individuals who may have less ability to overcome barriers to abortion care."

- After an initial surge in funding and support after the 2022 Dobbs ruling, many abortion clinics and providers are struggling to stay open, even in states that support abortion care. Challenges include the increased costs as more patients must travel for care and cuts in reimbursements and grants. In March of 2025, the Department of Health and Human Services withheld $27.5 million from reproductive health clinics, only some of which provide abortion services. (Federal funding does not include abortion care, but family planning, contraception, cancer screenings and testing and treatment of sexually transmitted infections.) The closure of these clinics, which accept Medicaid and are often in areas with few healthcare providers, creates health and reproductive care deserts. The abortion care website, I Need An A, notes 105 clinics have closed since the Dobbs decision, 40 of which were in states with abortion bans or restrictions, but 65 closures happened in states with abortion protections. The proposals from the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress to bar federally subsidized health insurance plans from covering abortion would further exacerbate closures, especially in states with abortion protections. The Supreme Court ruling in Medina v. Planned Parenthood South Atlantic on June 26th has paved the way for states to block all Medicaid funding to clinics like Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood federations across the country are looking to states, including California, to provide emergency funding to keep clinics open.

- To mark the three-year anniversary of the Dobbs decisions on June 22nd, advocates, patients and lawmakers gathered in Washington D.C. for the Free & Just Storyteller summit. In Congress, Democrats reintroduced the Women's Health Protection Act of 2025. The bill previously passed the House but failed in the Senate.

- Florida Representative Kat Cammack ignited a firestorm after blaming Democrats for delays in care after she was found to have an ectopic pregnancy in 2024. Florida instituted its six-week abortion ban that month, just before Cammack, who was five weeks pregnant at the time, went to the hospital. Doctors were concerned giving her abortion medication would violate the new law. Cammack said she "pulled up the law on her phone and even tried to call the governor's office" to convince doctors to treat her. Keisha Mulfort, a spokesperson for the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Florida responded to Cammack's claims that the delay was a result of fear mongering by the left stating the delays were "a direct consequence of Florida lawmakers passing extreme, confusing, and politically motivated abortion bans."

- Weeks after the shooting of two state legislators and their spouses in Minnesota, resulting in the death of Rep. Melissa Hortman and her husband, questions remain about the motive of the shooter, Vance Boelter. Many researchers and academics point to patterns that mimic anti-abortion violence, especially in conservative, Evangelical Christian movements. Many of these movements, including New Apostolic Reformation (NAR), invoke violence in their rhetoric, labeling those that disagree with their beliefs as enemies. Boelter used language and themes consistent with the beliefs and rhetoric espoused by NAR. Fred Clarkson, a senior research analyst at Political Research Associates stated, "It's reasonable to be concerned in the present that this movement we call the New Apostolic Reformation, is priming the pump for anti-abortion and other kinds of violence in our society now."

- Medical providers are leaving states with abortion restrictions and bans, according to a report, *Relocation Post-Dobbs Among Clinicians Providing Abortions*, published in the JAMA Network. The survey included clinicians (physicians, advanced practice clinicians, and nurses) that had practiced abortion care before or at the time of the survey. Over 90% of the clinicians in the survey also provided non-abortion care. Researchers found that 42% of respondents in states with abortion bans had relocated, with 89% of those relocating to states without bans. Many doctors cite issues navigating complex legal and bureaucratic barriers that result in delayed care as reasons

for leaving and express concerns for former patients and guilt for leaving. Dana Howard, an assistant professor in the division of bioethics at Ohio State University who conducted the survey, noted that when providers move, "their whole primary practice is being relocated, and that means that patients end up being left behind." The shift is exacerbating maternity deserts in places like South Carolina, where 13% of the state's counties are classified as maternity deserts.

- Medical providers in states with abortion care protections are advocating for additional privacy protections to strengthen shield laws. Providers are hoping to have personal identifying information removed from prescriptions, as the information has been used in civil and criminal attempts to persecute providers. Currently, New York, Maine, Vermont and Washington have laws to remove prescriber names from abortion pill bottles; proposals are moving forward in Massachusetts and California.

- More and more abortion care providers are supportive of self-administered abortion pills. University of California San Francisco professor Jen Karlin conducted a study of providers and their perceptions of the safety of self-administered abortion. After the COVID-19 pandemic, interest and support for self-administered abortion care increased as physicians sought to provide safe and virtual care. The World Health Organization declared self-managed abortion to be in the first trimester in 2022. In 2024, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists issued a statement in support of it. However, the new administration has called for a re-evaluation of mifepristone and may push for additional testing and in-person visits before patients receive the medication.

- The case of Atlanta nurse Adriana Smith has raised numerous questions about how personhood laws impact maternal and abortion care in states. Even in Georgia, Republicans disagreed with the application of the state's personhood law, called the LIFE Act. Attorney General Chris Carr said the laws did not require Ms. Smith to be kept on life support, while State Senator Ed Seltzer, who authored the LIFE Act, said that the hospital acted appropriately and hospitals should try to save the fetus. The baby was delivered prematurely by emergency caesarean section and Ms. Smith was removed from life support. Texas' personhood laws are also being used to try a man for capital murder for sneaking abortion medication into his pregnant partner's drink, resulting in a miscarriage. The case could have wine ranging implications: it could complicate fertility treatments, such as IVF, and the treatment of

unused frozen embryos.

- Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel filed a motion with the Michigan Court of Claims challenging the state's coercion screening provision, which was upheld after a judge in Michigan ruled that three other abortion restrictions in the state were unconstitutional as "they burden an individual's right to reproductive freedom." Nessel argued that the coercion restrictions are "discriminatory in comparison to how individuals continuing a pregnancy or receiving miscarriage management are treated, since they do not need to go through any coercion screening" and asked the judges to "reconsider their decision on the basis that the restriction is discriminatory."

- The anti-abortion group Lawyers for the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists has filed a suit asking the state Supreme Court to overturn a 1998 ruling that declared the state constitution affords Mississippians a right to abortion. Last year, a county judge ruled that members of AAPLOG did not have standing in the case. AAPLOG has hired a new law firm and is asking the court to "clarify whether Mississippi considers elective abortion a crime or a constitutional right."

- Republican lawmakers in Ohio continue to try to undermine the state's 2023 amendment that enshrined abortion protections in the state constitution. The "Ohio Prenatal Equal Protection Act" would overturn the amendment which establishes "an individual right to one's own reproductive medical treatment, including but not limited to abortion" before viability; criminalize abortion providers and patients, and would not include any exemptions for rape or incest. The Act's sponsors are trying to use the U.S. Constitution's equal protection clause to overturn the state's constitutional amendment.

- The U.S. Supreme Court has ordered a New York court to take a new look at whether religious organizations that serve and employ people regardless of their beliefs should be excluded from a state regulation requiring health insurance plans to cover abortions. The state currently exempts religious employers that primarily employ and serve individuals of their faith as part of their core work to spread their religious values.

- Pennsylvania Senators have introduced a shield law to build on an executive order that prohibits state officials and agencies from cooperating with out-of-state bodies looking to arrest or prosecute abortion care providers or patients. The two lawmakers, Sens.

Amanda Cappelletti and Judith Schwank noted the need to codify the order, and to protect providers and patient privacy from disclosures in court cases or investigations.

- In Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, a mother and daughter are facing criminal charges after the mother, Shannon Jones, helped her daughter get an at home abortion. The daughter is being tried as a juvenile for "concealing the death of a newborn baby and abusing its corpse" and Jones was charged with "endangering the welfare of children, corruption of minors and criminal conspiracy to conceal the death of a child." It is unknown if the fetus, which was around 20 weeks, was born alive. Pennsylvania allows abortions up to 24 weeks, but medication abortion is only permitted through 10 weeks of pregnancy. The case is seen as raising legal questions as the charges have traditionally been used to prosecute other crimes. Dickinson Law professor Emily Spottswood noted "The abuse of corpse crime is really targeted at people who desecrate graves or steal corpses...There's a lot of vagueness about some of these charges." Abortion advocates worry that the case could set a precedent to allow conservative bodies in states with abortion protections to criminalize abortion patients and those supporting them.

- Texas Governor Greg Abbott signed into law the Life of the Mother Act, which narrowly defines the circumstances in which medical providers may administer abortion care to protect the life of a pregnant person. The law allows a doctor to perform an abortion if "continuing the pregnancy poses a serious risk to the mother's health even if her life is not in immediate danger." Proponents argue that doctors can now provide abortion care to a pregnant cancer patient or before a patient becomes septic. Others argue the measure is vague and leaves doctors with little guidance. The legislation does not expand access, and Texas still does not have exceptions for abortions in the case of rape or incest.

- Sheriff Adam King of Johnson county, Texas, used automated license plate readers (ALPRs) to track the location of a woman that had a medication abortion in Texas. King used 83,000 cameras nationwide, including cameras in states where abortion is legal, to track the woman. The Electronic Frontier Foundation noted that "audit logs released through public records requests simply list "investigation" as the reason for the plate search" without noting the offense. Illinois Secretary of State Alexi Giannoulias asked for an investigation into a police department in the state that provided data to Sheriff King. Flock, the maker of ALPRs, has since walled off cameras in

California, Virginia and Illinois after news reported on King's tracking and collaborations between law agencies and ICE.

- A federal investigation found that a Texas hospital that denied a woman, Kyleigh Thurman, abortion care multiple times violated the federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act and broke the law. In February of 2023, Thurman visited Ascension Seton Williamson in Round Rock, Texas, multiple times, and at each visit displayed symptoms of an ectopic pregnancy. She was first given a pamphlet on miscarriage; three days later she was given medication to end the pregnancy, but it was too late. Within days she returned with a ruptured fallopian tube and required emergency surgery. Parts of her reproductive system had to be removed. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services determination was made late in 2024, but the Trump administration's decision to rescind the prior guidance on EMTALA will only create more risk for patients. Providers in Texas already warn that restrictions are confusing and discourage abortion care, even in emergencies, as doctors face up to 99 years in prison if convicted of performing an illegal abortion.

- A Texas appeals court sided with Attorney General Ken Paxton and halted the city of San Antonio from distributing funds to individuals to support them seeking abortion care outside the state. In 2023, the San Antonio City Council created the Reproductive Justice Fund, and looked to support efforts for out-of-state travel. The larger case Paxton brought against San Antonio is ongoing.

- Texas Senate bill 2880 stalled in the Texas House of Representatives after it failed to get a floor vote before the close of the legislative session. The legislation would have allowed private citizens to sue anyone involved with the production, prescription, or distribution of abortion medication for a minimum of $100,000 in hopes of curbing telehealth and medication abortion access in the state. Efforts to seek criminal prosecution of or sue out of state providers have stalled as other states enact shield laws and other privacy protections for abortion care providers and patients. Aspects of the bill could still be added as amendments to future legislation, or advance if Governor Abbott calls a special session this summer.

- A new law set to take effect on July 1 in Wyoming would remove abortion medications from the list of FDA approved medications that providers in the state can proscribe "off-label." Abortion rights advocates have filed a suit challenging the statute, as well as other restrictions in the state. They have asked a judge to block the

section of the statute that pertains to abortion medication while the cases progress.

II. State Policy Update

- Attorney General Rob Bonta and 19 other attorneys general sent an open letter to the American Medical Association urging them to help protect prospective OB-GYNs, as candidates are forced to travel to Dallas, Texas to complete in-person certifying exam. The letter called out increasingly hostile environments that deter potential candidates and create barriers to medical certification.

- Attorney General Rob Bonta filed a petition alongside the attorneys general of Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey to the Food and Drug Administration requesting it ease its restrictions on the abortion pill mifepristone. The petition stated: "no new scientific data has emerged since the FDA's last regulatory actions that would alter the conclusion that mifepristone remains exceptionally safe and effective…[and studies] that have frequently been cited to undermine mifepristone's extensive safety record have been widely criticized, retracted, or both."

III. San Francisco Bay Area Abortion Rights Coalition Update

- The Department on the Status of Women continues to work with regional partners and participate in meetings with abortion rights advocates in fiscal year 25/26. We will be working with our partners to help implement recommendations from our regional abortion landscape report, "Preparing for an Uncertain Future in Post-Dobbs America."

Item 6

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: OEWD BoS Annual Gift Reporting
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:53:18 AM
Attachments:	OEWD BoS Annual Gift Report FY 24-25_Signed.pdf

Hello,

Please see below Office of Economic Workforce Development (OEWD) Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2025, in accordance with Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c).

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Lozano, Alesandra (ECN) <alesandra.lozano@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:49 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Tano, Crezia (ECN) <crezia.tano@sfgov.org>; Taupier, Anne (ECN) <anne.taupier@sfgov.org>; Liedl, Fred (ECN) <fred.liedl@sfgov.org>; Saraie, Jeremy (ECN) <jeremy.saraie@sfgov.org>
Subject: OEWD BoS Annual Gift Reporting

Greetings,

Per Admin Code 10.100-305, attached is the annual report of all gifts received by the Office of

Economic and Workforce Development for fiscal year 2024-2025 which should be distributed to the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,

-Alesandra

Alesandra Lozano

Legislative & Government Affairs Manager
San Francisco Office of Economic & Workforce Development
415-269-4465

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Office of Economic & Workforce Development are public records and may be subject to the Sunshine Ordinance and can be requested by the public.

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Mayor Daniel Lurie
Executive Director Anne Taupier

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 448, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-6969 oewd@sfgov.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 02, 2025
TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Anne Taupier, ECN Executive Director
SUBJECT: FY 2024-2025 Annual Gifts Report

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-305(c), this memorandum provides the Board of Supervisors a report on all gifts received by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development during FY 2024-25.

Donor Name	Date Received	Value	Description
Palmer Family Trust	10/10/2024	$100.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund
Franklin Yam Ching	10/13/2024	$10.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund
Myles Kelley	10/17/2024	$20.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund
Marc Loran	10/18/2024	$20.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund
Jesse Juarros	10/19/2024	$25.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund
Donn J Thompson	10/25/2024	$100.00	Gift to the San Francisco Music and Entertainment Recovery Fund

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 448, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-6969 oewd@sfgov.org

Donor Name	Date Received	Value	Description
Administration for Market Regulation of Hunan Province (China)	11/1/2024	$11.00	International delegation visit/meeting with OEWD - gift of 1 "Paper Cut in China" book on facial makeup of Peking Opera.
Jiangsu Provincial Department of Housing and Urban Rural Development	11/15/2024	$20.00	International delegation visit/meeting with OEWD - gift of 1 decorative brocade fabric encased in a frame with accompanying bag.
Government of Zheijiang Province, County of Zinchang (China)	11/21/2024	$24.00	International delegation visit/meeting with OEWD - gift of three box sets of black tea with accompanying bag.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Fondation	2/19/2025	$410.00	Two tickets to the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce CityBeat luncheon.
Mr. Xiaojin Zhang	2/19/2025	$20.00	2 each of the following: (pen, notebook, bookmarks and pen drive).
Jiangxi Province Department of Commerce	3/3/2025	$40.00	2 China grass cloth decorative scrolls.
La Cocina	4/22/2025	$750.00	Three tickets to the La Cocina 20th Anniversary Gala Dinner. Each ticket was $250.

SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Mayor Daniel Lurie
Executive Director Anne Taupier

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 448, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-6969 oewd@sfgov.org

Donor Name	Date Received	Value	Description
Consulate General of the Netherlands	4/28/2025	$29.10	Four gifts: (notebook ($7.00), stroopwafel cookie (~$3.00), Prodir biotic pen (~$2.10), Dopper 450 ml water bottle ($17.00).
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce	4/29/2025	$0	Four tickets to the closing celebration for San Francisco Small Business Week.
Union Square Foundation	5/2/2025	$880.00	Eight tickets to the Union Square Foundation's Annual Fundraiser Luncheon.
Commercial Counselor of Guatemala	5/5/2025	$64.00	6 items - 2 pens (~$1.00 each); 2 worry dolls figurines (~$1.00 each); 2 Del Cid 12oz Coffees ($30.00 each)
Calle 24 Latino Cultural District	6/19/2025	$150.00	2 tickets to a Calle 24 video release and fundraiser.

Anne Taupier

Signature

July 2, 2025

Date Signed

Item 7

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SOTF (BOS)
Subject:	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force File No. 25003 - SF Zoological Society
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:46:00 AM
Attachments:	06.10.25 SOTF Letter to BOS re SF Zoo.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached, from the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF), regarding SOTF File No. 25003, involving the San Francisco Zoological Society.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

(415) 554-7724
(415) 554-7854 Fax
415) 554-5227 TDD/TTY

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

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

President Rafael Mandelman &
Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

June 10, 2025

Dear Mr. President and Supervisors –

The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) has an ongoing complaint File No 25003 against the SF Zoological Society for violations of Admin Code 67 (herein, Sunshine Ordinance). We have deemed as per their agreement with SF Recreation and Parks Department, hence, the City & County of San Francisco that they are required to abide and comply with the Sunshine Ordinance, and wish to appraise you of this serious situation regarding maintaining transparency in our city government and its entities, programs and services.

As a result of our findings we have made the following determinations:

1. On 2/5/2025, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force held a hearing to review the recommendation from the Complaint Committee and/or review the merits of the petition/complaint.
   Action: Moved by Vice-Chair Stein, seconded by Member Pilpel, that the San Francisco Zoological Society is subject to the Sunshine Ordinance under the SF Zoo Lease and Management Agreement of 1993 (Section E of the Recitals section and Section 16.2), to find a violation of Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance) Section 67.21(b) for not responding to a public records request in complete or timely manner and Section 67.21(e) for not sending an authorized representative to the Task Force hearing, turn over the requested records within 5 calendar days, and work with the Education, Outreach and Training Committee to achieve compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.
   The motion PASSED by the following vote:
   Ayes: 9 - Stein, Pilpel, LaHood, Sugarman, Kuman, Anderson, Hyland, Wolfe, Yankee
   Noes: 1 - Schmidt
   Absent: 0

2. On 4/2/2025, the Task Force found that the Zoological Society had **not** complied with the 2/5/2025 Order of Determination to produce records, and that the Zoological Society **is subject to the Sunshine Ordinance under the SF Zoo Lease and Management Agreement of 1993**. The Task Force asked that Recreation and Parks Department General Manager Phil Ginsburg facilitate the production of those records and referred the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee for monitoring.

3. On 4/22/2025, the Compliance and Amendments Committee acknowledged receipt of a 4/21/2024 letter from Recreation and Parks General Manager Ginsburg to SF Zoological Society Executive Director Tanya Peterson asking that this and all future public records requests related the San Francisco Zoo be facilitated by the Recreation and Parks Custodian of Records. General Manager Ginsburg further requested that the records pertaining to File No. 25003 be provided to Petitioner no later than May 1, 2025. (see attached letter from Director Ginsburg)

SOTF finds this to be an egregious violation and has remained frustrated after several attempts to resolve the matter reasonably. We also understand there is an audit into the affairs of the SF Zoological Society. SOTF has no other recourse but to refer the matter to you, the SF Board of Supervisors, for review and possible action of your choosing as per Admin Code 67.30(c), "The task force shall report to the Board of Supervisors at least once annually on any practical or policy problems encountered in the administration of this chapter.", and "The Task Force shall make referrals to a municipal office with enforcement power under this ordinance or under the California Public Records Act and the Brown Act whenever it concludes that any person has violated any provisions of this ordinance or the Acts."

If you, the SF Board of Supervisors, see fit to exercise Admin Code 67.30(d), "In addition to the powers specified above, the Task Force shall possess such powers as the Board of Supervisors may confer upon it by ordinance or as the People of San Francisco shall confer upon it by initiative.", to confer any powers to SOTF to help effectuate and/or expedite this matter, we will do so, dutifully, to the best of our ability and capacity to bring this complaint to a conclusion.

Yours Truly,

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

Item 8

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SOTF (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force File No. 25003 - SF Zoological Society
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 3:09:00 PM
Attachments:	06.10.25 SOTF Letter to BOS re SF Zoo.pdf 25003 Respondent 20250421 Facilitation Letter to Director Peterson without Transmittal Memo.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please also see the attached response from Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, Recreation and Parks Department, regarding SOTF File No. 25003, involving the San Francisco Zoological Society.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:47 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SOTF

(BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force File No. 25003 - SF Zoological Society

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached, from the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF), regarding SOTF File No. 25003, involving the San Francisco Zoological Society.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
bos@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

Docusign Envelope ID: F6EACC1E-3251-4684-8DBE-11BA42DF041C

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Kat Anderson, Commission President
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

Tanya Peterson, CEO & Executive Director, SF Zoological Society
San Francisco Zoo, 1 Zoo Road
San Francisco, CA 94132

April 21, 2025

Dear Director Peterson,

Recently, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) notified the Department of a complaint File No. 25003 against the San Francisco Zoo for allegedly violating Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance), Section(s) 67.21, by failing to respond to a public records request in a timely and/or complete manner. The SOTF requested my assistance as the General Manager to facilitate the production of these records. The matter will be monitored by the Compliance and Amendments Committee of the SOTF at its meeting on April 22, 2025 and referred to the full Task Force at its meeting of May 7, 2025 for follow-up if needed.

The Recreation and Park Department handles numerous public records requests at any given time and aims to provide records in a timely and complete manner. Our Custodian of Records and Commission Liaison, Ashley Summers, works collaboratively with staff and our City Attorney to ensure that appropriate records are produced. She also ensures that necessary records are withheld or redacted on the basis of attorney-client privilege or personal privacy.

Under the Joint Zoo Management Agreement Section 16.2, Public Access to Records and Information, it reads:

> SFZS shall provide public access to information concerning the operation of the Zoo to the same extent that such information would have been available to the public pursuant to local ordinances if the Department had continued to operate the Zoo in the same manner as it did prior to the date of this Agreement. In addition, SFZS shall comply with all state and federal laws, rules and regulations that govern access by the public to records and information, including without limitation the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Secs. 6250 et seq.) Without limiting the foregoing, SFZS further agrees that (a) minutes shall be taken at each meeting of its Board of Directors, and that the minutes of those meetings shall be considered public documents available for public inspection in accordance with the Public Records Act, and (b) all information concerning the status of all animals exhibited or otherwise housed or cared for at the Zoo shall be deemed public information subject to public inspection under the Public Records Act.

To move this matter forward, I would like to ask that this and all future public records requests related to the San Francisco Zoo are facilitated by our Custodian of Records, who is familiar with local and state regulations pertaining to public records. She will work collaboratively with your staff to ensure appropriate records are produced in a timely fashion, and any records that should be withheld or redacted for privilege or privacy are handled accordingly. It is my belief that this will remove the burden from your staff from having to manage this process, which they may be unfamiliar with given yours is not a government agency.

Docusign Envelope ID: F6EACC1E-3251-4684-8DBE-11BA42DF041C

I would kindly request that your staff work together with Ashley to provide the records pertaining to File No. 25003 in a timely manner, but no later than May 1, 2025. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
AF27F6596709494...
Philip Ginsburg

cc: Anne Elefterakis, Executive Assistant, SF Zoological Society
Melinda Dunn, SF Zoological Society Board Member and Joint Zoo Committee Member
EB Beatty, SF Zoological Society Board Member and Joint Zoo Committee Member
Mary Sutton, SF Zoological Society Board Member and Joint Zoo Committee Member
Larry Mazzola, Jr. Commissioner and Chair of the Joint Zoo Committee
Kat Anderson, Recreation and Park Commission President and Joint Zoo Committee Member
Breanna Zwart, Commissioner and Joint Zoo Committee Member
Manu Pradhan, Deputy City Attorney
Patricia Petersen, Assistant Clerk, SF Board of Supervisors
Alisa Somera, Deputy Director, SF Board of Supervisors
Matthew Yankee, Chair, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

(415) 554-7724
(415) 554-7854 Fax
415) 554-5227 TDD/TTY

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

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

President Rafael Mandelman &
Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

June 10, 2025

Dear Mr. President and Supervisors –

The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) has an ongoing complaint File No 25003 against the SF Zoological Society for violations of Admin Code 67 (herein, Sunshine Ordinance). We have deemed as per their agreement with SF Recreation and Parks Department, hence, the City & County of San Francisco that they are required to abide and comply with the Sunshine Ordinance, and wish to appraise you of this serious situation regarding maintaining transparency in our city government and its entities, programs and services.

As a result of our findings we have made the following determinations:

1. On 2/5/2025, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force held a hearing to review the recommendation from the Complaint Committee and/or review the merits of the petition/complaint.
   Action: Moved by Vice-Chair Stein, seconded by Member Pilpel, that the San Francisco Zoological Society is subject to the Sunshine Ordinance under the SF Zoo Lease and Management Agreement of 1993 (Section E of the Recitals section and Section 16.2), to find a violation of Administrative Code (Sunshine Ordinance) Section 67.21(b) for not responding to a public records request in complete or timely manner and Section 67.21(e) for not sending an authorized representative to the Task Force hearing, turn over the requested records within 5 calendar days, and work with the Education, Outreach and Training Committee to achieve compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.
   The motion PASSED by the following vote:
   Ayes: 9 - Stein, Pilpel, LaHood, Sugarman, Kuman, Anderson, Hyland, Wolfe, Yankee
   Noes: 1 - Schmidt
   Absent: 0

2. On 4/2/2025, the Task Force found that the Zoological Society had **not** complied with the 2/5/2025 Order of Determination to produce records, and that the Zoological Society **is subject to the Sunshine Ordinance under the SF Zoo Lease and Management Agreement of 1993**. The Task Force asked that Recreation and Parks Department General Manager Phil Ginsburg facilitate the production of those records and referred the matter to the Compliance and Amendments Committee for monitoring.

3. On 4/22/2025, the Compliance and Amendments Committee acknowledged receipt of a 4/21/2024 letter from Recreation and Parks General Manager Ginsburg to SF Zoological Society Executive Director Tanya Peterson asking that this and all future public records requests related the San Francisco Zoo be facilitated by the Recreation and Parks Custodian of Records. General Manager Ginsburg further requested that the records pertaining to File No. 25003 be provided to Petitioner no later than May 1, 2025. (see attached letter from Director Ginsburg)

SOTF finds this to be an egregious violation and has remained frustrated after several attempts to resolve the matter reasonably. We also understand there is an audit into the affairs of the SF Zoological Society. SOTF has no other recourse but to refer the matter to you, the SF Board of Supervisors, for review and possible action of your choosing as per Admin Code 67.30(c), "The task force shall report to the Board of Supervisors at least once annually on any practical or policy problems encountered in the administration of this chapter.", and "The Task Force shall make referrals to a municipal office with enforcement power under this ordinance or under the California Public Records Act and the Brown Act whenever it concludes that any person has violated any provisions of this ordinance or the Acts."

If you, the SF Board of Supervisors, see fit to exercise Admin Code 67.30(d), "In addition to the powers specified above, the Task Force shall possess such powers as the Board of Supervisors may confer upon it by ordinance or as the People of San Francisco shall confer upon it by initiative.", to confer any powers to SOTF to help effectuate and/or expedite this matter, we will do so, dutifully, to the best of our ability and capacity to bring this complaint to a conclusion.

Yours Truly,

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

Item 9

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thurs 7/10/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:10:53 PM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1596_Agenda.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached, from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), for the agenda for the July 10, 2025 meeting of the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT).

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:07 PM
Cc: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thurs 7/10/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Hello,

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, July 10, 2025.

If you have any questions, please email us.

--

Nick Chapman
Manager, SFMTA Special Events
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Pronouns: he/him, they/them

ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of July 10, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1596th Regular Meeting

Online Participation	Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing Click on the Raise your hand icon. When you are prompted to unmute, click on the microphone icon to speak.
Phone Participation	Please dial +1 415-523-2709,,397937701# Find a local number Phone conference ID: 397 937 701# Dial *5 to be placed in the queue for public comment. When prompted dial *6 to unmute yourself.

Please ensure that you are in a quiet location, speak clearly, and turn off any TVs or radios around you.

Written Participation	Submit your written comments to SpecialEvents@SFMTA.com with "Public Hearing" in the subject line or by mail to SFMTA, 1 South Van Ness, 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments must be received by 12 noon on the day prior to the hearing to be considered.

415.646.2414: For free interpretation services, please submit your request 48 hours in advance of meeting. / 如果需要免費口語翻譯，請於會議之前 48 小時提出要求 / Para servicios de interpretación gratuitos, por favor haga su petición 48 horas antes de la reunión./ Para sa libreng serbisyo sa interpretasyon, kailangan mag-request 48 oras bago ang miting.

MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2025, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)
The Committee to adopt the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Members of the public may address ISCOTT members on matters that are within ISCOTT purview and are not on today's agenda.

TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)
These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

CONSENT CALENDAR
If there are no objections from the committee or the public, the following items will be voted on as a group.

A. 45th Avenue between Pacheco and Quintara streets
Saturday, August 16, 2025, 9 am to 6 pm
Block Party - 45th Avenue Annual

B. 12th Avenue between Judah and Kirkham streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 2 pm to 10 pm
Block Party - 12th Ave

C. Coleridge Street between Kingston Street and Cortland Avenue
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 8 am to 8 pm
Block Party - Coleridge St 13th Annual

D. Temescal Terrace between Turk Blvd and Golden Gate Avenue
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 8 am to 4 pm
Block Party - University Terrace

E. Whitney Street between 30th and Randall streets
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Block Party – Lower Whitney Street

F. Filbert Street between Divisadero and Broderick streets
Sunday, September 28, 2025, 10 am to 5 pm
Block Party – Filbert Street

G. Eugenia Avenue between Wool and Andover streets
Saturday, October 4, 2025, 11 am to 3 pm
Block Party – Wool-Eugenia-Andover

H. Harrington Street between Mission Street and approx. 150' west; Norton Street between Mission Street and approx. 150' west; 20 – Norton/Mission Lot

Friday, November 14, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

Excelsior Night Market

REGULAR CALENDAR

I. Brussels Street between Wilde Avenue and Harkness Street

Saturday, August 2, 2025, 10:30 am to 8 pm

Block Party - Brussels St - The Little Hood That Could

J. Lillian Court between Beatrice and Rosie Lee lanes

Tuesday, August 5, 2025, 12 pm to 6 pm

Block Party - Lillian Ct - National Night Out

K. Hampshire Street between 20th and 21st streets

Sunday, August 17, 2025, 1 pm to 7 pm

Block Party - Hampshire St

L. Danvers Street between 18th Street and Caselli Avenue

Sunday, October 19, 2025, 12 pm to 5 pm

Block Party – Fall '25 Castro Heights

M. Ingerson Avenue between Redondo and Hawes streets

Saturday, July 12, 2025, 8 am to 8 pm

Jesai Kingston Way Street Sign Unveiling

N. Harrington Street between Mission Street and 150' west of Mission Street

Friday, August 1, 2025, 10 am to 1 pm

Jerry Garcia Street Naming

O. O'Farrell Street between Fillmore and Steiner streets

Sunday, August 17, 2025, 11 am to 5 pm

Soulful Sunday

P. Laguna Street between Golden Gate Avenue and Turk Street

Saturday, August 23, 2025, 7 am to 7 pm

Trailblaze Community Block Party

Q. Pacific Avenue between Steiner and Fillmore streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 8 am to 5 pm
Calvary Nursery School 70th Anniversary

R. York Street between 24th and 25th streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 11 am to 6 pm
Casa Bandido Mural Celebration

S. King Street between 7th and De Haro streets
Thursday, July 24, 2025, 6 am to 6 pm
Adobe San Francisco Street Food Festival

T. Jersey Street between Castro and Diamond streets
Sunday, July 27, 2025, 11 am to 5 pm
SF Marathon at Running Wylder

U. Maiden Lane between Stockton Street to Grant Avenue
Sunday, August 3, 2025, 12 pm to 5 pm
The Base Line Fashion Show

V. Erie Street between Mission and easterly terminus
Saturday, August 16, 2025, 9 am to 9 pm
Bass and Brunch

W. Grant Avenue between California Street and Broadway; Commercial Street between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street
Intersection closed: Commercial Street at Grant Avenue
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 6 am to 6 pm
SF Chinatown Car Show & Car Parade

X. Post Street between Fillmore and Laguna streets; Webster Street between Sutter Street and Geary Blvd
Intersection closed: Post Street at Webster Street
Saturday, August 2, 2025, 5 am
Sunday, August 3, 2025, 9 pm
51st Annual Nihonmachi Street Fair

Y. Haight Street between Pierce and Webster streets
Intersection closed: Haight at Steiner
Saturday, August 2, 2025, 10 am to 10 pm
Lower Haight Summer Art Walk

Z. 1275 - 20th Ave/Irving Lot
Monday, August 4, 2025, 8 am to 9 pm
Outer Sunset Maker's Market

AA. Hayes Street between Gough and Octavia streets; Linden Street between Gough and Octavia streets; Octavia Street between Hayes and Fell streets
Intersection closed: Linden Street at Octavia Street
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 6 am to 7 pm
Head West Marketplace

BB. Maiden Lane between Stockton Street and Grant Avenue
Friday, July 18, 2025, through
Wednesday, December 31, 2025,
11 am to 3 pm, each Tuesday through Thursday
and
Maiden Lane between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street
Friday, July 18, 2025, through
Sunday, December 28, 2025,
11 am to 6 pm, each Friday through Sunday
Union Square Alliance Maiden Lane Activations

CC. Jones Street between Greenwich and Lombard streets
Wednesday, July 23, 2025, 9:30 am to 4 pm
Beacon Summer Cardboard Car Derby

Categorically exempt from CEQA: CEQA Guidelines Section 15304 Class 4(e) minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environment, including carnivals, sales of Christmas trees, etc. and/or Section 15305 Class 5(b) minor alterations in land use limitations, including street closings and equipment for special events

_____

Forrest Chamberlain Date
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

The following item has been environmentally cleared by the Planning Department on April 19, 2021, Addendum #2 to San Francisco Better Streets Plan Project [Case No. 2021-003010ENV (addendum to Case No. 2007.1238E)]:

NONE

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

The following items are presented for informational purposes and public comment. Closures are subject to review and approval by the SFMTA Board.

NONE

***SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S OFFICES, ONE SOUTH VAN NESS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103, DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS. PLEASE CONTACT TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES/SPECIAL EVENTS AT specialevents@sfmta.com. ***

Sound Producing Devices
The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Disability Access
To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact (415) 701-4683 at least two business days before the meeting. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to perfumes and various other chemical-based scented products. Please help the City to accommodate these individuals.

Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by email at *sotf@sfgov.org*. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at web site *http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine*.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements
Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2200, fax (415) 581-2217, web site *www.sfgov.org/ethics*.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Appeal Rights under S.F. Admin. Code Chapter 31: For identified Approval Actions**,** the Planning Department or the SFMTA has issued a CEQA exemption determination or negative declaration, which may be viewed online at the Planning Department's website**.** Following approval of the item by ISCOTT, the CEQA determination is subject to appeal within the time frame specified in S.F. Administrative Code Section 31.16 which is typically within 30 calendar days. For information on filing a CEQA appeal, contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, or call (415) 554-5184. Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or submitted in writing to the City prior to or at such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.

Item 10

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on Gifts from SFPD
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:51:00 AM
Attachments:	FY2024-2025 Gifts Received up to $10,000.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Police Department, submitting an annual report on gifts and donations (up to $10,000) and donations to the homicide reward fund, pursuant to Administrative Code, Sections 67.29-6, 10.100-305, and 10.100-306.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Yeung, Fannie (POL) <fannie.w.yeung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Li, Lily (CON) <lily.li@sfgov.org>; Wu, Kimmie (POL) <Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org>
Subject: Annual Report on Gifts from SFPD

Please see the attached Annual Report on Gifts up to $10,000 received by the San Francisco Police Department in Fiscal Year 2024.

Thank you,

Fannie Yeung
San Francisco Police Department
Grants Manager, Fiscal Division
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
Tel: (415) 837-7212

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California 94158

PAUL YEP
INTERIM CHIEF OF POLICE

July 1, 2025

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Subject: Annual Report on Gifts and Donations (Up to $10,000) and Donations to the Homicide Reward Fund

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Sections 67.29-6, 10.100-305, and 10.100-306, this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with a report on gifts up to $10,000 and donations to the Homicide Reward Fund received by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).

During FY 24-25, SFPD received the following gifts/donations:

- Donation of toys and books from member of the public for the SFPD Holiday Toy Drive, estimated value at approximately $200-$300
- Donation of funds from the San Francisco Police Community Foundation for the SFPD Holiday Toy Give Away, valued at $9,000
- Donation of travel and hotel accommodations for two members for the 2025 Asians in Law Enforcement Leadership Conference, valued at $1,804.92
- Donation of luncheon from the California State Automobile Association for the Vehicle Theft Abatement Awards, valued at $9,851.84
- Donation of eight pieces of art to the Mounted Unit, estimated cumulative value of $2,000

During FY 24-25, SFPD did not receive any donations to the Homicide Reward Fund. There are no activities to report.

Please contact Fannie Yeung at fannie.yeung@sfgov.org or 415-837-7212 if you have any questions or need additional information about the gifts SFPD received.

Sincerely,

Paul Yep
Interim Chief of Police

Item 11

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SFPUC BOS Report - 2025 DEF Water Bonds Report
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:54:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png SFPUC BOS Report - 2025 Water Bonds DEF Report Final.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, submitting a 2025 Water Bonds Report, pursuant to Ordinance No. 131-24.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Kwak, Eric <EKwak@sfwater.org>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sklaroff, Nikolai (PUC) <NSklaroff@sfwater.org>; Kwong, Edward (PUC) <EKwong@sfwater.org>; Fuchs, Daniel (PUC) <DFuchs@sfwater.org>; Dunivan, Earl (PUC) <EDunivan@sfwater.org>; de Araujo, Gisele (PUC) <GdeAraujo@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>
Subject: SFPUC BOS Report - 2025 DEF Water Bonds Report

Hi,

Kindly include the attached 2025 Water Bonds Report to File Number 240455 as required by Ordinance No. 131-24.

Please confirm receipt.

Thank you,

Eric Kwak
Debt Analyst
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Office: (415) 487-5207
ekwak@sfwater.org

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.551.2973

June 30, 2025

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please see the attached Memorandum for the Board of Supervisors 2025 Water Enterprise Revenue Bond New Money and Refunding Sale Report for $988,260,000 Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the Municipal Advisor for the transaction, Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC. The 2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF were issued pursuant to authorization from the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco to retire commercial paper and finance or refinance capital projects benefitting the Water Enterprise and refund any outstanding obligations to the Water Enterprise.

The Report to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, together with a copy of the final Official Statement for the new money and refunding bonds, are being provided in accordance with Board of Supervisors Ordinance 131-24.

Sincerely,

/s/ Nikolai J. Sklaroff

Nikolai J. Sklaroff
Capital Finance Director
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Kate H. Stacy
President

Joshua Arce
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Stephen E. Leveroni
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

MONTAGUE DEROSE
AND ASSOCIATES, LLC

Memorandum

To:	Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
From:	Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC
Date:	June 30, 2025
Subject:	Board of Supervisors - 2025 Water Enterprise Revenue Bond New Money and Refunding Sale Report $304,505,000 Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series D (Regional Water and Local Water) $133,480,000 Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series E (Hetch Hetchy Water) $550,275,000 Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series F (Refunding)

Background:

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Board of Supervisors") has adopted various ordinances which have authorized the issuance of new money Water Revenue Bonds and Water Revenue Refunding Bonds to finance, and refinance, the costs of capital projects benefiting the Water Enterprise (together, the "Authorizing Legislation"). The most recent of this Authorizing Legislation was Ordinance No. 131-24, adopted on June 18, 2024.

Pursuant to the Authorizing Legislation, on June 12, 2025, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (the "SFPUC") issued $304.505 million of the Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series D (Regional Water and Local Water), $133.480 million of the Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series E (Hetch Hetchy Water), and $550.275 million of the Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Sub-Series F (Refunding) (together the "2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF") for the following primary purposes:

- **2025 Water Sub-Series D Bonds (Regional Water and Local Water**): issued to refund commercial paper and finance capital projects benefiting the SFPUC's Regional Water Program and Local Water Program and to fund capitalized interest.
- **2025 Water Sub-Series E Bonds (Hetch Hetchy Water)**: issued to refund commercial paper and finance capital projects benefiting the SFPUC's Hetch Hetchy Water Program and to fund capitalized interest.
- **2025 Water Sub-Series F Bonds (Refunding):** issued to refund by exercising the extraordinary redemption provision on the SFPUC's outstanding Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Sub-Series B (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment) (the "2010B BABs) and Water revenue Bonds, 2010 Sub-Series E (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment) (the "2010E BABs", together with the 2010B BABs Bonds, the "2010 B and E BABs") to mitigate the risks of a reduction or elimination of the Federal subsidy associated with said Build America Bonds. Pursuant to Ordinance No. 131-24, the Commission approved this refinancing despite it not satisfying the 3% net present value debt service savings test by finding that significant non-economic factors exist that justify the waiver of the savings test (i.e., to mitigate risk of the Federal government reducing or

eliminating the BABs subsidy payment, which it has done in the past, and which now relies on Congressional action to waive sequestration).

Per the Authorizing Legislation, within 30 days of a new money or refunding bond issuance, the SFPUC must file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors the following:

a. New Money Bond Sale Report showing the results of the sale of the bonds, including (a) principal amount sold and method of sale, (b) true interest cost, (c) final maturity, (d) the facilities constructed and/or improved, and (e) a statement about the remaining bonding authorization under the applicable financing budget ordinance.

b. Refunding Bonds Savings Report that reflects at least a 3% net present value debt service savings, unless the Commission found that significant non-economic factors exist to justify waiving the 3% NPV debt service savings test, together with a copy of the final Official Statement for the refunding bonds.

The SFPUC has requested that Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC, who served as co-municipal advisor to the 2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF, prepare this combined New Money Bond Sale and Refunding Bond Savings report for purposes of complying with the requirements set forth in Ordinance No. 131-24.

New Money Bond Sale Report:

The SFPUC priced the 2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF on June 5, 2025, via negotiated sale and issued the bonds on June 12, 2025. The 2025 Series D Bonds and 2025 Series E Bonds were issued for new money purposes, the details of which are noted in Table 1.

Table 1 | Summary Statistics: 2025 New Money Bonds

	2025 Water Sub-Series D Bonds (Regional Water and Local Water)	2025 Water Sub-Series E Bonds (Hetch Hetchy Water)
Pricing Date	June 5, 2025	June 5, 2025
Closing Date	June 12, 2025	June 12, 2025
Method of Sale	Negotiated	Negotiated
Final Maturity	11/01/2055	11/01/2055
Principal Amount Sold	$304.505 million	$133.480 million
True Interest Cost	4.892%	4.988%

Table 2 includes a list of projects by authority which are to be fully or partially funded with the proceeds of the 2025 Series D Bonds and 2025 Series E Bonds.

Table 2 | Projects Financed with 2025 Water New Money Bonds
Projects
2025 Series D Bonds
Sunol Valley Water Treatment
Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant & West Bay Fields
Regional Groundwater Treatment Improvements
Water Transmission Program
Corrosion Control
Pump Station Upgrades
Pipeline Improvements
Dam Structural Upgrades
Watershed and Land Management
Bay Area Watershed and Right of Way Protection
Skyline Ridge Trail
San Andreas-1 Service Road – Ingoing Road
Sunol Long Term Improvement
Millbrae Yard Upgrade
Program Management
Regional Water Treatment
Valve Replacement
Calaveras Dam and Reservoir
Sunol Yard Upgrades
Communications
Alameda Watershed Monitoring
Peninsula Watershed Monitor
Regional Groundwater Storage
Upper Alameda Creek Filter
Purified Water & Other Supplies
Regional Water Treatment Renewal & Replacement
Water Transmission Renewal & Replacement
Water Buildings and Grounds Renewal & Replacement
Long Term Monitoring & Permitting
Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant Short Term Improvement
Habitat Reserve Program
Program Management Services
Pipeline Replacement
Town of Sunol Pipeline
College Hill Reservoir
Harding Park Pump Station
Lake Merced Water Level Restoration
San Francisco Groundwater Supply
Recycled Water Project
New City Distribution Division Headquarters
New Services
Renew Services
Local Water Conveyance - distribution
Pacific Rod & Gun Club Remedial Action

Systems Monitoring & Controls
Pump Station Improvements
Lake Merced Pump Station
Automated Meter Reading System
Building & Grounds Improvement
Lombard Geotechnical Improvement
Water Diversification Projects
Buildings & Grounds – Regional
Lake Merced Pump Station Upgrade
2025 Series E Bonds
Hetchy Water – Water Only
Hetchy Water – Joint Projects

Remaining Authorization under Ordinance No. 131-24:

As of June 1, 2025, pursuant to Proposition E, the SFPUC had authorized but unissued water revenue bonds or other forms of indebtedness in the amount of $1,696,974,012.00 under Proposition E. Following the issuance of the 2025 Series D Bonds and 2025 Series E Bonds, and the subsequent retirement of commercial paper notes with proceeds of the bonds, and the issuance of the 2025 Series F Bonds, which has been deducted from the ordinance's authorization amount under Ordinance No. 131-24 since there are no Net Present Value savings until future amendment to the Ordinance can be enacted, the SFPUC has $708,714,012.00 of authorized but unissued bonds remaining under Proposition E.

Refunding Bonds Report:

The 2025 Series F Bonds were issued to refund the 2010 B and E BABs due to the threat of increased sequestration or elimination of the Federal subsidy payments and a desire to mitigate the risk of the loss of the subsidy which would have a significant adverse impact on the SFPUC. Ordinance No. 131-24 requires refunding bonds to meet a 3% NPV debt service savings test, unless the Commission makes a finding, by resolution, that significant non-economic factors exist that justify the waiver of this savings test. The Commission adopted Resolution No. 25-0086 on May 27, 2025 that authorized the issuance of the 2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF and waived the refunding savings test for the 2025 Series F Bonds by finding that the following significant non-economic factors do exist:

- "the federal subsidy rate originally provided to the Commission's Build America Bonds has been reduced and such reduced subsidy rate has applied for many years and is at risk of being reduced further or eliminated through legislation or otherwise; and
- the exclusion of interest from owner's income subject to federal income taxation or other tax benefits available to the Commission's bonds could be diminished or eliminated through legislation or otherwise."

The 2025 Series F Bonds were priced on June 5, 2025 and closed on June 12, 2025 as part of the same negotiated sale. Details of the refinancing results of the 2025 Series F Bonds are included in Table 3 (note, as stated, this refinancing was not required to satisfy the 3% NPV debt service savings test typically required for refunding bonds due to the significant non-economic factors discussed above).

Table 3 | Summary Statistics: 2025 Series F Bonds	
	2025 Water Sub-Series F Bonds (Refunding)
Pricing Date	June 5, 2025
Closing Date	June 12, 2025
Method of Sale	Negotiated
Principal Amount Sold	$550.275 million
Par Amount of Refunded Bonds	$614.100 million
NPV Savings (%)	-0.09%
NPV Savings ($)	-$572,741.52

It should be noted that while Table 3 indicates the refunding of the 2010 B and E BABs had minimal Net Present Value dissavings (which reflects the release of the debt service reserve fund), this issuance generated positive annual cashflow savings of nearly $2 million and more than $39 million of cashflow savings through 2041. Further, the SFPUC created future potential refunding opportunities in its debt portfolio by replacing the taxable 2010 B and E BABs bonds with tax-exempt bonds which can generate potential additional refunding savings on about $79 million of the bonds in about 10 years, when they will be subject to optional redemption at par by the SFPUC.

A copy of the final Official Statement for the 2025 Water Revenue Bonds, Series DEF is included with this report.

NEW ISSUE – Book-Entry Only

Ratings:
Moody's: "Aa2"
S&P: "AA-"
(See "RATINGS.")

In the opinion of Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, San Francisco, California, Bond Counsel, under existing statutes, regulations, rulings and judicial decisions, and assuming compliance with certain covenants in the documents pertaining to the 2025DEF Bonds and requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as described herein, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is not included in the gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes. In the further opinion of Bond Counsel, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is not treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax on individuals. Bond Counsel is also of the opinion that, under existing law, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is exempt from personal income taxes of the State of California. See "TAX MATTERS" herein.

San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

$988,260,000
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF

$304,505,000	$133,480,000	$550,275,000
2025 Sub-Series D	**2025 Sub-Series E**	**2025 Sub-Series F**
(Regional Water and Local Water)	**(Hetch Hetchy Water)**	**(Refunding)**

Dated: Date of Delivery

Due: November 1, as shown on inside cover page

This cover page contains certain information for quick reference only. It is not intended to be a summary of the security or terms of the water revenue bonds captioned above. Potential investors are instructed to read the entire Official Statement, including the appendices hereto, to obtain information essential to making an informed investment decision.

General. This Official Statement provides information regarding the above-captioned bonds (collectively, the "**2025DEF Bonds**") of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "**SFPUC**"). Capitalized terms not otherwise defined on this cover shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms herein.

Authority for Issuance. The SFPUC is issuing the 2025DEF Bonds pursuant to authority granted by the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (the "**City**"). The 2025DEF Bonds will be issued under supplemental indentures that supplement the Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002 (as amended and supplemented, the "**Indenture**"), by and between the SFPUC and U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as successor to U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee (the "**Trustee**"). See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

Plan of Finance. The 2025DEF Bonds are being issued to refund tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes issued to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects of benefit to the SFPUC's Water Enterprise, to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects of benefit to the SFPUC's Water Enterprise, to refund certain outstanding water revenue bonds of the SFPUC, to fund capitalized interest on the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds through May 1, 2027, and to pay the costs of issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE" and "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS."

Denominations and Interest. The 2025DEF Bonds will be available in denominations of $5,000 or any integral multiple thereof and will mature in the years and amounts and accrue interest from their date of delivery at the rates set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement. Interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is payable semiannually on May 1 and November 1 of each year, commencing November 1, 2025. See "THE 2025DEF BONDS."

Book-Entry Only. The 2025DEF Bonds will be issued as fully registered bonds, registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company ("**DTC**"), New York, New York, and will be available to ultimate purchasers (the "**Beneficial Owners**") under the book-entry only system maintained by DTC. Beneficial Owners will not receive physical certificates representing their interests in the 2025DEF Bonds. The principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the 2025DEF Bonds are payable to DTC by the Trustee, and, so long as DTC is acting as securities depository for the 2025DEF Bonds, disbursements of such payments to DTC Participants is the responsibility of DTC and disbursements of such payments to the Beneficial Owners is the responsibility of DTC Participants. See "THE 2025DEF BONDS."

Redemption. The 2025DEF Bonds are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturities as described herein. See "THE 2025DEF BONDS – Redemption."

Security. Under the Indenture, the SFPUC has irrevocably pledged the Revenues of its Water Enterprise and all Refundable Credits (in the case of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds) received by the SFPUC to the punctual payment of principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the 2025DEF Bonds and all outstanding parity revenue bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness authorized under the Indenture, subject to the allocation of funds provided in the Indenture. The 2025DEF Bonds are payable on parity with certain Outstanding Bonds previously issued by the SFPUC under the Indenture and all outstanding parity revenue bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness authorized under the Indenture. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

Limited Obligation. **The SFPUC is not obligated to pay the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds except from Revenues of the Water Enterprise. The SFPUC has no taxing power. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City is pledged to the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds. The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of the City or of the SFPUC or any of its income or receipts, except Revenues of the Water Enterprise. The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by the revenues of the SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise or Power Enterprise or the revenues of CleanPowerSF. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."**

MATURITY SCHEDULES
(See inside cover page)

The 2025DEF Bonds are offered when, as and if issued by the SFPUC and received by the Underwriters, subject to the approval of validity by Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, San Francisco, California, Bond Counsel to the SFPUC, and to certain other conditions. Certain matters will be passed upon for the SFPUC and the City by Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, San Francisco, California, Disclosure Counsel, and by the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco. Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC, Walnut Creek, California, and Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co., LLC, San Francisco, California, Co-Municipal Advisors to the SFPUC, assisted in the structuring of this financing. Certain matters will be passed upon for the Underwriters by Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California. It is expected that the 2025DEF Bonds in fully registered form will be available for delivery in book-entry form through the facilities of DTC on or about June 12, 2025.

J.P. Morgan **Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC**

Barclays **Ramirez & Co., Inc.** **Siebert Williams Shank & Co., LLC** **Stifel**

The date of this Official Statement is June 5, 2025.

MATURITY SCHEDULES

2025 Sub-Series D
(Regional Water and Local Water)

Maturity (November 1)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Yield*	Price*	CUSIP† Base Number 79771F
2051	$60,440,000	5.00%	4.73%‡	102.190‡	LJ4

$244,065,000 5.00% Term Bonds due November 1, 2055 Yield* 4.79%‡ Price* 101.697‡ CUSIP† 79771F LK1

2025 Sub-Series E
(Hetch Hetchy Water)

$133,480,000 5.25% Term Bonds due November 1, 2055 Yield* 4.74%‡ Price* 104.139‡ CUSIP† 79771F LL9

2025 Sub-Series F
(Refunding)

Maturity (November 1)	Principal Amount	Interest Rate	Yield*	Price*	CUSIP† Base Number 79771F
2025	$20,415,000	5.00%	2.65%	100.892	LM7
2026	24,585,000	5.00	2.63	103.202	LN5
2027	25,810,000	5.00	2.62	105.467	LP0
2028	27,095,000	5.00	2.63	107.627	LQ8
2029	28,445,000	5.00	2.64	109.711	LR6
2030	29,865,000	5.00	2.69	111.507	LS4
2031	31,355,000	5.00	2.79	112.842	LT2
2032	32,915,000	5.00	2.92	113.726	LU9
2033	34,560,000	5.00	3.00	114.728	LV7
2034	36,280,000	5.00	3.14	115.016	LW5
2035	38,095,000	5.00	3.29	114.937	LX3
2036	20,190,000	5.00	3.49‡	113.057‡	MD6
2036	19,805,000	5.00	3.55	113.480	LZ8
2037	8,535,000	5.00	3.63‡	111.762‡	ME4
2037	33,455,000	5.00	3.68	113.032	MA2
2038	30,235,000	5.00	3.75‡	110.667‡	MF1
2038	13,850,000	5.00	3.85	111.937	MB0
2039	46,285,000	5.00	3.98	111.086	LY1
2040	20,140,000	4.00	4.22	97.525	MG9
2040	28,360,000	5.00	4.09	110.311	MC8

* Reoffering yields and prices have been provided by the Underwriters. See "UNDERWRITING."

† CUSIP is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, which is managed on behalf of the American Bankers Association by FactSet Research Systems Inc. This data is not intended to create a database and does not serve in any way as a substitute for the CUSIP Global Services data base. Neither the SFPUC nor the Underwriters assume any responsibility for the accuracy of the CUSIP data.

‡ Yield and price to call at par on November 1, 2035.

Map of Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System



Figure 1-1 (Not to Scale) – The above map depicts the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System, which delivers water approximately 160 miles from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir to San Francisco. The Water Enterprise consists of over 1,235 miles of pipeline, 11 reservoirs, six groundwater wells, 11 storage tanks, 25 pump stations, eight hydropneumatic stations and 18 chlorination stations located within the San Francisco city limits and further comprises over 389 miles of pipeline, over 74 miles of tunnels, 11 reservoirs, 13 groundwater wells, five pump stations, and three water treatment plants located outside of San Francisco. For further description of the SFPUC's Water System, see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE."

The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of the SFPUC or any of its income or receipts, except Revenues. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

Map of Service Area and Locations of Wholesale Customers



1. Alameda County Water District
2. City of Brisbane
3. City of Burlingame
4a. California Water Service – Bear Gulch
4b. California Water Service – Mid-Peninsula
4c. California Water Service – South San Francisco
5. Coastside County Water District
6. City of Daly City
7. City of East Palo Alto
8. Estero Municipal Improvement District
9. Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District
10. City of Hayward
11. Town of Hillsborough
12. City of Menlo Park
13. Mid-Peninsula Water District
14. City of Millbrae
15. City of Milpitas
16. City of Mountain View
17. North Coast County Water District
18. City of Palo Alto
19. Purissima Hills Water District
20. City of Redwood City
21. City of San Bruno
22. City of San José
23. City of Santa Clara
24. Stanford University
25. City of Sunnyvale
26. Westborough Water District

Figure 1-2 (Not to Scale) – The above map depicts the Water Enterprise service area (not including the Groveland Community Service District) and the locations of the Wholesale Customers (as defined herein). The Water Enterprise serves water to approximately 2.7 million people in the San Francisco Bay Area region, delivering approximately 185 million gallons per day of water. For further description of the Wholesale Customers, see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Wholesale Deliveries."

The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of any of the Wholesale Customers or any of their respective revenue, income or receipts. The 2025DEF Bonds are secured solely by the Revenues of the Water Enterprise as described herein. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

GENERAL INFORMATION

No dealer, broker, salesperson or other person has been authorized by the SFPUC to give any information or to make any representation other than those contained herein and, if given or made, such other information or representation must not be relied upon as having been authorized by the SFPUC.

This Official Statement does not constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to buy, nor shall there be any sale of the 2025DEF Bonds, by any person in any jurisdiction in which it is unlawful for such person to make such an offer, solicitation or sale. This Official Statement is not to be construed as a contract with the purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds. Any statement made in this Official Statement involving any forecast or matter of estimates or opinion, whether or not expressly so stated, is intended solely as such and not as a representation of fact.

The information set forth herein other than that provided by the SFPUC, although obtained from sources which are believed to be reliable, is not guaranteed as to accuracy or completeness. The information and expressions of opinion herein are subject to change without notice and neither delivery of this Official Statement nor any sale made hereunder shall, under any circumstances, create any implication that there has been no change in the affairs of the SFPUC or the City since the date hereof.

The Underwriters have provided the following sentence for inclusion in this Official Statement: The Underwriters have reviewed the information in this Official Statement in accordance with, and as part of, their responsibilities to investors under the federal securities laws as applied to the facts and circumstances of this transaction, but the Underwriters do not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of such information.

The City maintains a website at https://www.sf.gov/ and the SFPUC maintains a website at https://www.sfpuc.gov/. The City and the SFPUC also maintain social media accounts. In addition, certain information and reports found on other websites and other information and reports are referred to in this Official Statement. *The websites are provided for convenience only and information and reports available on such websites, social media accounts and the other referenced information and reports, are not incorporated by reference into this Official Statement and should not be relied upon in making an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds.*

The issuance and sale of the 2025DEF Bonds have not been registered under the Securities Act of 1933 in reliance upon the exemption provided thereunder by Section 3(a)(2) for the issuance and sale of municipal securities.

IN CONNECTION WITH THE OFFERING OF THE 2025DEF BONDS, THE UNDERWRITERS MAY OVERALLOT OR EFFECT TRANSACTIONS WHICH STABILIZE OR MAINTAIN THE MARKET PRICE OF THE 2025DEF BONDS AT LEVELS ABOVE THAT WHICH MIGHT OTHERWISE PREVAIL IN THE OPEN MARKET. SUCH STABILIZING, IF COMMENCED, MAY BE DISCONTINUED AT ANY TIME. CONSEQUENTLY, THE MARKET PRICE PAID BY AN INVESTOR DURING THE STABILIZATION PERIOD MAY BE HIGHER THAN THE PREVAILING MARKET PRICE.

This Official Statement is delivered for use in connection with the issuance, sale and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds and may not be reproduced or used, in whole or in part, for any other purpose.

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

CERTAIN STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN THIS OFFICIAL STATEMENT REFLECT NOT HISTORICAL FACTS BUT FORECASTS AND "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS." ALL FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS ARE PREDICTIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO KNOWN AND UNKNOWN RISKS AND UNCERTAINTIES. NO ASSURANCE CAN BE GIVEN THAT THE FUTURE RESULTS DISCUSSED HEREIN WILL BE ACHIEVED, AND ACTUAL RESULTS MAY DIFFER MATERIALLY FROM THE FORECASTS DESCRIBED HEREIN. IN THIS RESPECT, THE WORDS "ESTIMATE," "PROJECT," "ANTICIPATE," "EXPECT," "INTEND," "BELIEVE" AND SIMILAR EXPRESSIONS ARE INTENDED TO IDENTIFY FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS. ALL PROJECTIONS, FORECASTS, ASSUMPTIONS, EXPRESSIONS OF OPINIONS, ESTIMATES AND OTHER FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS ARE EXPRESSLY QUALIFIED IN THEIR ENTIRETY BY THE CAUTIONARY STATEMENTS SET FORTH IN THIS OFFICIAL STATEMENT. GIVEN THEIR UNCERTAINTY, INVESTORS ARE CAUTIONED NOT TO PLACE UNDUE RELIANCE ON SUCH STATEMENTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
General 1
Authority for Issuance 1
Plan of Finance 2
The SFPUC and the Water Enterprise 2
SFPUC Water Supply 2
Security for the Bonds 3
Outstanding and Future Parity Bonds and Other Indebtedness 3
Amendments Effected by Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture 3
Risk Factors 4
Continuing Disclosure 4
Other Matters 4
THE 2025DEF BONDS 5
General 5
Securities Depository and Book-Entry Only System 5
Redemption 5
Defeasance 7
PLAN OF FINANCE 7
General 7
Refunded Bonds 8
ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS 9
SECURITY FOR THE BONDS 9
Pledge of Revenues 9
Flow of Funds 11
Rate Covenants 13
No Bond Reserve Account for the 2025DEF Bonds 14
Additional Series of Bonds 15
Refunding Bonds 16
Other Parity Obligations; Subordinate Obligations; Obligations Not Payable from Revenues 16
Investments 16
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE 17
OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES 17
Authority for Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Other Obligations Payable from Revenues 17
Outstanding Parity Revenue Bonds 19
Parity State Loans 20
Corps Water Infrastructure Financing Program 21
Contingent Payment Obligations 21
Subordinate Debt and Interim Funding Program 21
Other Subordinate Obligations Payable from Revenues 22
Revenue Bond Oversight Committee; Audit of Bond Expenditures 22
Debt Service Requirements 23
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 24
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 25
General 25
Organization, Purposes and Powers 26
Commission Members 27
Management 27
Employee Relations 29
Employee Benefit Plans 31
THE WATER ENTERPRISE 34
General 34
Water Rights and Related Proceedings 34
Current Water Supply Sources 35
Water Supply Storage 36
Water Supply Reliability and Drought Planning 36
Wholesale Deliveries 37
Retail Deliveries 45
Historical Water Sales and Top Customers 46
Recent Factors Impacting Retail Water Sales 47
Current Water Conditions 48
Curtailment Actions by the State Water Resources Control Board 49
Projected Demand 50
Cybersecurity 53
Climate Change 54
Climate Action Plan 58
WATER FACILITIES 59
General 59
Water Conveyance and Distribution 60
Water Treatment 61
Water Storage 62
Physical Condition of Certain Facilities 64
Prior Heavy Storms 65
Seismic Hazards 65
Wildfire Considerations 67
Emergency Firefighting Water System 67
Safety and Security 68
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES 68
Capital and Financial Planning Process 68
Regional Water Program 69
Local Water Program 69
Hetch Hetchy Water 70
Water System Improvement Program 71
Water Supply Initiatives 72
Environmental Planning Considerations 75
FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS 76
Long Term Financing of Capital Program 76

Interim Funding Program Facilities 76
Sources of Funding the Capital Improvement Program 76
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS 77
General 77
Wholesale Water Sales Revenue 78
Retail Water Sales Revenue 80
Capacity Charges 86
Operating and Maintenance Expenses 86
Financial Management Policies 87
Investment of SFPUC Funds 88
Risk Management and Insurance 89
HISTORICAL OPERATING RESULTS 91
PROJECTED OPERATING RESULTS 93
RISK FACTORS 96
General 96
Bond Payment Risks 96
Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations 97
Risks Relating to Financial Operations 100
Bankruptcy Risk 101
Other Risks 102
REGULATORY MATTERS 105
General 105
Drinking Water Requirements 105
Public Water System Discharges 110
Bay Delta Water Quality Standards 110
FERC Proceeding to Increase Flows in the Lower Tuolumne River 112
Dam Licensing and Safety Issues 113
Hazardous Material Management 117
Endangered Species 117
Required Instream Flow Schedules from Regional Water System Dams 117
CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS 118
State Law Limitations 118
Initiative and Referendum 120
Charter Limitations 121
Future Charter Amendments 121
LITIGATION 121
TAX MATTERS 121
CERTAIN LEGAL MATTERS 123
RATINGS 124
UNDERWRITING 124
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS 125
CONTINUING DISCLOSURE 125
CO-MUNICIPAL ADVISORS 126
VERIFICATION OF MATHEMATICAL ACCURACY 126
INDEPENDENT PRICING CONSULTANT 126
MISCELLANEOUS 126
APPROVAL AND DELIVERY 127

APPENDIX A SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE
APPENDIX B SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT
APPENDIX C SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
APPENDIX D PROPOSED FORMS OF OPINIONS OF BOND COUNSEL
APPENDIX E FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE
APPENDIX F SECURITIES DEPOSITORY AND THE BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Kate H. Stacy, President
Joshua Arce, Vice President
Avni Jamdar, Commissioner
Stephen E. Leveroni, Commissioner
Meghan Thurlow, Commissioner

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OFFICIALS

Dennis J. Herrera, General Manager
Ronald P. Flynn, Deputy General Manager and Chief Operating Officer
Nancy L. Hom, Assistant General Manager, Business Services and Chief Financial Officer
Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water Enterprise
Masood Ordikhani, Assistant General Manager, External Affairs
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power Enterprise
Stephen Robinson, Assistant General Manager, Infrastructure Division
Joel Prather, Assistant General Manager, Wastewater Enterprise

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MAYOR
Daniel Lurie

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Rafael Mandelman, District 8, President
Connie Chan, District 1
Chyanne Chen, District 11
Matt Dorsey, District 6
Joel Engardio, District 4
Jackie Fielder, District 9
Bilal Mahmood, District 5
Myrna Melgar, District 7
Danny Sauter, District 3
Shamann Walton, District 10
Stephen Sherrill, District 2

CITY ATTORNEY
David Chiu

CITY TREASURER
José Cisneros

OTHER CITY AND COUNTY OFFICIALS
Greg Wagner, Controller
Carmen Chu, City Administrator

SPECIAL SERVICES

Bond Counsel
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP
San Francisco, California

Disclosure Counsel
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
San Francisco, California

Trustee
U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association
San Francisco, California

Co-Municipal Advisors
Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC
Walnut Creek, California

Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co., LLC
San Francisco, California

Verification Agent
AW Smith LLC
Rockford, Minnesota

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

$988,260,000
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF

$304,505,000	**$133,480,000**	**$550,275,000**
2025 Sub-Series D	**2025 Sub-Series E**	**2025 Sub-Series F**
(Regional Water and Local Water)	**(Hetch Hetchy Water)**	**(Refunding)**

INTRODUCTION

This Introduction is qualified in its entirety by reference to the more detailed information included and referred to elsewhere in this Official Statement. The offering of the hereinafter defined 2025DEF Bonds to potential investors is made only by means of the entire Official Statement. Capitalized terms used in this Introduction and not otherwise defined have the respective meanings assigned to them elsewhere in this Official Statement, including "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE."

General

This Official Statement, including the cover page and Appendices hereto, is provided to furnish certain information in connection with the offering by the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "**SFPUC**") of its San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF, 2025 Sub-Series D (Regional Water and Local Water) (the "**2025D Bonds**"), San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF, 2025 Sub-Series E (Hetch Hetchy Water) (the "**2025E Bonds**"), and San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF, 2025 Sub-Series F (Refunding) (the "**2025F Bonds**" and, together with the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds, the "**2025DEF Bonds**").

Authority for Issuance

The 2025DEF Bonds will be issued by the SFPUC pursuant to authority granted by the Charter (the "**Charter**") of the City and County of San Francisco (the "**City**") through Proposition E, approved by San Francisco voters on November 5, 2002 ("**Proposition E**"), and by the Charter and ordinances of the Board of Supervisors of the City (the "**Board of Supervisors**"). In addition, the 2025DEF Bonds will be issued under resolutions adopted by the SFPUC governing body (the "**Commission**") on May 27, 2025.

The 2025D Bonds will be issued under a Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture (the "**Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture**"), dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the SFPUC and U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as successor to U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee (the "**Trustee**"). The 2025E Bonds will be issued under a Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture (the "**Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture**"), dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee. The 2025F Bonds will be issued under a Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture (the "**Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture**"), dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee. The Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, the Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture and the Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture each supplement the Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002 (as amended and supplemented, the "**Indenture**"), by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee.

See also "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Authority for Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Other Obligations Payable from Revenues."

Plan of Finance

The 2025DEF Bonds are being issued to refund tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes (as defined herein) issued to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects of benefit to the SFPUC's Water Enterprise, to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects of benefit to the SFPUC's Water Enterprise, to refund certain outstanding water revenue bonds of the SFPUC, to fund capitalized interest on the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds through May 1, 2027, and to pay the costs of issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE," "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS."

The SFPUC and the Water Enterprise

The SFPUC is a department of the City responsible for the maintenance, operation and development of three utility enterprises. See "THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION."

The SFPUC owns and operates a municipal water supply, storage and distribution system (the "**Water Enterprise**") that provides drinking water to (i) retail customers in San Francisco and certain retail customers outside of San Francisco (collectively, the "**Retail Customers**"), (ii) 26 wholesale customer entities in San Mateo, Alameda and Santa Clara counties that are members of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency ("**BAWSCA**") pursuant to the hereinafter defined Water Supply Agreement and individual contractual agreements (collectively, the "**Wholesale Customers**"), and (iii) one additional wholesale customer, Cordilleras Mutual Water Company in San Mateo County (which is not a BAWSCA member or a party to the Water Supply Agreement), pursuant to an individual contractual agreement. The Water Enterprise consists of water treatment, storage and transmission facilities located outside of San Francisco (the "**Regional Water System**") and water treatment, storage and distribution facilities located inside San Francisco (the "**In-City Distribution System**"). See "WATER FACILITIES."

Water rates for Retail Customers are set by the SFPUC, subject to rejection by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Retail water sales typically account for approximately 30% of total water sales, and revenues from such retail water sales generally account for approximately 50% of total water sales revenues. Water rates for Wholesale Customers are set pursuant to the Water Supply Agreement between the City and the Wholesale Customers, which became effective in 2009 and was most recently amended and restated in 2021 (the "**Water Supply Agreement**" or "**WSA**"). The Commission approved an amendment to the WSA on May 13, 2025, for the purpose of adjusting the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities (as defined in the WSA) for four Wholesale Customers. The SFPUC anticipates that all of the Wholesale Customers will approve such amendment within the next six months. Wholesale water sales typically account for approximately 70% of total water sales and revenues from such wholesale water sales generally account for approximately 50% of total water sales revenues.

For more information regarding water sales, water sales revenues, and the WSA, see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE," "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS" and "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT."

The SFPUC also provides wastewater services to customers in San Francisco and to several wholesale customers outside of San Francisco (the "**Wastewater Enterprise**"), and power, mainly hydroelectric, for City government operations and to other users (the "**Power Enterprise**"), and manages a Community Choice Aggregation program ("**CleanPowerSF**"). **The revenues of these other enterprises are not available for, and do not secure, payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the Bonds (as defined herein), including the 2025DEF Bonds**.

SFPUC Water Supply

The SFPUC's primary water supply source is the Upper Tuolumne River watershed in the Sierra Nevada mountains. The amount of water available to the SFPUC is subject to prevailing hydrological conditions and may be limited during times of drought. The SFPUC has taken a variety of steps to enhance water supply reliability. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE."

Security for the Bonds

Under the Indenture, the SFPUC has irrevocably pledged the Revenues of its Water Enterprise and all Refundable Credits (in the case of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds) received by the SFPUC to the punctual payment of principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the 2025DEF Bonds and all outstanding parity revenue bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness authorized by the Indenture (collectively, the "**Bonds**"), subject to the allocation of funds provided in the Indenture. The 2025DEF Bonds are payable on parity with certain Outstanding Bonds previously issued by the SFPUC under the Indenture.

The SFPUC is not obligated to pay the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds except from Revenues of the Water Enterprise. The SFPUC has no taxing power. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City is pledged to the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds. The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of the City or of the SFPUC or any of its income or receipts, except Revenues of the Water Enterprise. The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by the revenues of the Wastewater Enterprise or the Power Enterprise or the revenues of CleanPowerSF.

No Bond Reserve Account will be established for the 2025DEF Bonds. Bond Reserve Accounts have been established with respect to certain other series of Bonds, but such Bond Reserve Accounts do not secure the 2025DEF Bonds.

See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

Outstanding and Future Parity Bonds and Other Indebtedness

The SFPUC has previously issued Bonds, and in the future expects to issue additional Bonds, pursuant to the Indenture and secured by Revenues of the Water Enterprise on parity with the 2025DEF Bonds. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES."

The Indenture provides that additional series of Bonds secured by Revenues on parity with the Outstanding Bonds and the 2025DEF Bonds (each an "**Additional Series of Bonds**") may be issued if certain conditions are met. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Additional Series of Bonds."

The SFPUC may issue additional Bonds from time to time to fund additional capital projects (see "FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS") and may also issue refunding Bonds (see "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Refunding Bonds").

Amendments Effected by Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture

The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture (the "**Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture**"), dated as of July 1, 2023, by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee, amends and supplements certain provisions of the Indenture, including provisions relating to the calculation of "Maximum Annual Debt Service," "Annual Debt Service," "Average Annual Debt Service," the incurrence of "Parity Loans," the conditions under which Additional Series of Bonds may be issued, the filing of annual audited financial information with the Trustee and the rate covenants. The provisions of the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture will become effective when the written consents of the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding and of each Credit Provider, if any, have been filed with the Trustee and certain other requirements under the Indenture have been satisfied. Approximately 32.8% of the aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds currently Outstanding have been obtained. **By their purchase of 2025DEF Bonds, the purchasers of 2025DEF Bonds irrevocably agree to, accept and consent to the provisions of such amendments**. Upon the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, approximately 50.8% of the aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding will have been obtained. See "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO

INDENTURE" for a more detailed explanation of the amendments effected by the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture.

Risk Factors

Investment in the 2025DEF Bonds is subject to certain risks that should be considered, in addition to other matters set forth in this Official Statement, in evaluating an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds. For a general overview of certain risk factors, see "RISK FACTORS."

Continuing Disclosure

The SFPUC will covenant for the benefit of the Owners and Beneficial Owners of the 2025DEF Bonds to provide certain financial information and operating data regarding the Water Enterprise not later than March 31 following the end of its Fiscal Year (presently June 30), beginning on March 31, 2026, with respect to the report for Fiscal Year 2024-25, and to provide notices of the occurrence of certain enumerated events. These covenants will be made to assist the Underwriters in complying with Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "**Rule**"). See "CONTINUING DISCLOSURE" and "APPENDIX E – FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE."

Other Matters

Brief descriptions of the 2025DEF Bonds, the security and sources of payment for the 2025DEF Bonds, the SFPUC, the Water Enterprise, the SFPUC's capital improvement program are provided herein. Such descriptions do not purport to be comprehensive or definitive. Definitions of certain capitalized terms used herein may be found in "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE." All references made to various documents herein are qualified in their entirety by reference to the forms thereof, all of which are available for inspection at the office of the SFPUC at:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Attention: Assistant General Manager, Business Services and Chief Financial Officer
(415) 554-3155

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

THE 2025DEF BONDS

General

The 2025DEF Bonds will be dated as of their date of delivery and will accrue interest from their date of delivery at the rates per annum set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement. Interest on the 2025DEF Bonds will be calculated on the basis of a 360-day year consisting of twelve 30-day months. Interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is payable on May 1 and November 1 of each year, beginning November 1, 2025.

The 2025DEF Bonds will mature on the dates and in the principal amounts set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement. The 2025DEF Bonds will be issued in fully registered form in denominations of $5,000 or any integral multiple of $5,000.

Under the Indenture, the record date with respect to the payment of principal of and interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is the 15th day of the calendar month immediately preceding an interest payment date, whether or not such day is a Business Day.

Securities Depository and Book-Entry Only System

The 2025DEF Bonds will be registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee for The Depository Trust Company ("**DTC**"), New York, New York, as the Owner of the 2025DEF Bonds. So long as DTC, or its nominee, Cede & Co., is the Owner of the 2025DEF Bonds, all payments on the 2025DEF Bonds will be made directly to DTC. Disbursement of such payments to the DTC Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners of the 2025DEF Bonds will be the responsibility of the DTC Participants. See "APPENDIX F – SECURITIES DEPOSITORY AND THE BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM."

Redemption

Optional Redemption of 2025D Bonds. The 2025D Bonds are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity, at the option of the SFPUC, from any source of available funds, as a whole or in part, on any date on or after November 1, 2035, from such maturities or portions of maturities as are determined by the SFPUC and (except as otherwise provided under the procedures of Securities Depository for the 2025D Bonds) by lot within any one maturity, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the 2025D Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Mandatory Sinking Fund Redemption of 2025D Bonds. The 2025D Bonds maturing on November 1, 2055 (the "**2025D Term Bonds (2055)**"), are further subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity, and payable from the 2025D Sinking Fund Account, on each November 1 on and after November 1, 2052 (except as otherwise provided under the procedures of Securities Depository for the 2025D Bonds), by lot within any such maturity if less than all of the 2025D Term Bonds (2055) of such maturity are then being redeemed, upon payment of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

The 2025D Term Bonds (2055) are subject to mandatory redemption on November 1 in each of the years and in the respective principal amounts as follows (such schedule subject to adjustment as directed by the SFPUC in the event of optional redemption of any portion of such 2025D Term Bonds (2055) prior to maturity as described above):

Redemption Date (November 1)	Principal Amount
2052	$32,785,000
2053	64,715,000
2054	68,030,000
2055†	78,535,000

† Maturity.

Optional Redemption of 2025E Bonds. The 2025E Bonds are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity, at the option of the SFPUC, from any source of available funds, as a whole or in part, on any date on or after November 1, 2035 from such maturities or portions of maturities as are determined by the SFPUC and (except as otherwise provided under the procedures of Securities Depository for the 2025E Bonds) by lot within any one maturity, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the 2025E Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Mandatory Sinking Fund Redemption of 2025E Bonds. The 2025E Bonds maturing on November 1, 2055 (the "**2025E Term Bonds (2055)**"), are further subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity, and payable from the 2025E Sinking Fund Account, on each November 1 on and after November 1, 2052 (except as otherwise provided under the procedures of Securities Depository for the 2025E Bonds), by lot within any such maturity if less than all of the 2025E Term Bonds (2055) of such maturity are then being redeemed, upon payment of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

The 2025E Term Bonds (2055) are subject to mandatory redemption on November 1 in each of the years and in the respective principal amounts as follows (such schedule subject to adjustment as directed by the SFPUC in the event of optional redemption of any portion of such 2025E Term Bonds (2055) prior to maturity as described above):

Redemption Date (November 1)	Principal Amount
2052	$30,790,000
2053	32,450,000
2054	34,200,000
2055†	36,040,000

† Maturity.

Optional Redemption of 2025F Bonds. The 2025F Bonds maturing on November 1, 2036, issued in the original principal amount of $20,190,000, November 1, 2037, issued in the original principal amount of $8,535,000, November 1, 2038, issued in the original principal amount of $30,235,000, and November 1, 2040, issued in the original principal amount of $20,140,000, are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity, at the option of the SFPUC, from any source of available funds, as a whole or in part, on any date on or after November 1, 2035 from such maturities or portions of maturities as are determined by the SFPUC and (except as otherwise provided under the procedures of Securities Depository for the 2025F Bonds) by lot within any one maturity, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the 2025F Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Purchase In Lieu of Mandatory Sinking Fund Redemption. In lieu of mandatory sinking fund redemption of the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds as described above, the SFPUC may satisfy, in whole or in part, the related minimum Sinking Fund Account payment amounts and redemption of Term Bonds of the respective Sub-Series by depositing with the Trustee Term Bonds of the respective Sub-Series for cancellation prior to the Trustee's selection of the Term Bonds of such Sub-Series for redemption, or may request the Trustee to purchase Term Bonds of the respective Sub-Series, at public or private sale as and when and at such prices (including brokerage and other charges and including accrued interest) as the SFPUC may direct, not to exceed the principal amount thereof. The par amount of any of such 2025D Bonds or 2025E Bonds so deposited or purchased in any twelve-month period ending on September 15 in any year will be credited towards and will reduce the par amount of such 2025D Bonds or 2025E Bonds required to be redeemed as described above on the next succeeding November 1.

Selection of 2025DEF Bonds for Redemption. Subject to DTC's procedures relating to the selection of bonds for redemption described above, whenever less than all of the 2025DEF Bonds, of any one tenor and maturity are called for redemption and those 2025DEF Bonds are redeemable by lot, the Trustee will select the 2025DEF Bonds of the tenor and maturity to be redeemed from the Outstanding 2025DEF Bonds of that tenor and maturity, by lot or by any other manner the Trustee deems fair and equitable. For purposes of such selection, 2025DEF Bonds will be deemed to be made up of $5,000 portions of principal, any of which may be redeemed separately.

Notice of Redemption. Notice of redemption will be mailed by the Trustee at least 30 days but not more than 60 days prior to the redemption date, to DTC (so long as DTC's book-entry system is used). The actual receipt by the owner of any 2025DEF Bond of notice of such redemption is not a condition precedent to redemption, and failure to receive a redemption notice or any defect in a redemption notice will not affect the validity of the proceedings for the redemption of such 2025DEF Bond or the cessation of the accrual of interest on the date fixed for such redemption. See "APPENDIX F – SECURITIES DEPOSITORY AND THE BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM."

Rescission of Notice of Redemption. The SFPUC may, at its option, prior to the date fixed for redemption in any notice of optional redemption, rescind and cancel such notice of redemption by written request to the Trustee and the Trustee will mail notice of such cancellation to the recipients of the notice of redemption being cancelled.

Effect of Redemption. When notice of redemption has been duly given as described above, and moneys for payment of the redemption price are held by the Trustee, the 2025DEF Bonds called for redemption will, on the redemption date designated in such notice, become due and payable at the redemption price specified in such notice; and from and after the date so designated interest on such 2025DEF Bonds called for redemption will cease to accrue, and such 2025DEF Bonds will cease to be entitled to any benefit or security under the Indenture, and the Owners of said 2025DEF Bonds will have no rights in respect thereof except to receive payment of the redemption price thereof. The Trustee, upon surrender for payment of any of said 2025DEF Bonds will pay such 2025DEF Bonds at the applicable redemption price, together with accrued interest thereon. All 2025DEF Bonds redeemed will be cancelled upon surrender and no 2025DEF Bonds will be issued in place thereof.

Defeasance

The obligations of the SFPUC and the pledge, lien, covenants and agreements of the SFPUC made or provided for in the Indenture will be fully discharged and satisfied as to any 2025DEF Bond and will no longer be deemed outstanding thereunder if certain conditions set forth in the Indenture are satisfied. See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – DEFEASANCE."

PLAN OF FINANCE

General

Proceeds of the 2025D Bonds will be applied to (i) refund approximately $200.6 million principal amount of and interest on tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes issued to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects in furtherance of the SFPUC's Regional Water Program and Local Water Program, (ii) finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects in furtherance of the SFPUC's Regional Water Program and Local Water Program, (iii) fund capitalized interest on the 2025D Bonds through May 1, 2027, and (iv) pay the costs of issuance of the 2025D Bonds. The tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes to be refunded with the proceeds of the 2025D Bonds will be paid within 90 days of the issuance of the 2025D Bonds. See "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS" and "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN – Regional Water Program" and "– Local Water Program."

Proceeds of the 2025E Bonds will be applied to (i) refund approximately $112.8 million principal amount of and interest on tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes issued to finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects in furtherance of the SFPUC's Hetch Hetchy Water Program, (ii) finance and refinance a portion of the design, acquisition and construction of various capital projects in furtherance of the SFPUC's Hetch Hetchy Water Program, (iii) fund capitalized interest on the 2025E Bonds through May 1, 2027, and (iv) pay the costs of issuance of the 2025E Bonds. The tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes to be refunded with the

proceeds of the 2025E Bonds will be paid within 90 days of the issuance of the 2025E Bonds. See "ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS" and "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN – Hetch Hetchy Water Program."

Proceeds of the 2025F Bonds, together with other available funds, will be applied to (i) refund all of the SFPUC's outstanding San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series ABC, 2010 Sub-Series B (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment) (the "**2010B Bonds**"), and San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series DE, 2010 Sub-Series E (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment) (the "**2010E Bonds**" and, together with the 2010B Bonds, the "**Refunded Bonds**") and (ii) pay the costs of issuance of the 2025F Bonds. The 2010B Bonds and 2010E Bonds to be refunded with proceeds of the 2025F Bonds are being redeemed pursuant to the Extraordinary Optional Redemption provisions of the Seventh Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2010, and the Ninth Supplemental Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2010, respectively, each by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee. Such 2010B Bonds and the 2010E Bonds will be redeemed on June 12, 2025.

Refunded Bonds

The following tables list the Refunded Bonds as described above under "– General."

Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds
2010 Series ABC, 2010 Sub-Series B (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment)

Maturity (November 1)	Outstanding Principal Amount	Interest Rate	CUSIP* (Base No. 79765R)	Principal Amount to be Refunded	Redemption Date
2025**	$14,225,000	5.500%	SU4	$14,225,000	06/12/2025
2040**	295,195,000	6.000	SV2	295,195,000	06/12/2025
Total:	$309,420,000			$309,420,000	

** Term Bond.

Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds
2010 Series DE, 2010 Sub-Series E (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment)

Maturity (November 1)	Outstanding Principal Amount	Interest Rate	CUSIP† (Base No. 79765R)	Principal Amount to be Refunded	Redemption Date
2025	$14,080,000	5.300%	TG4	$14,080,000	06/12/2025
2026	14,585,000	5.500	TH2	14,585,000	06/12/2025
2027	15,125,000	5.700	TJ8	15,125,000	06/12/2025
2040**	260,890,000	6.000	TK5	260,890,000	06/12/2025
Total:	$304,680,000			$304,680,000	

** Term Bond.

* CUSIP is a registered trademark of the American Bankers Association. CUSIP data herein is provided by CUSIP Global Services, which is managed on behalf of the American Bankers Association by FactSet Research Systems Inc. This data is not intended to create a database and does not serve in any way as a substitute for the CUSIP Global Services data base. Neither the SFPUC nor the Underwriters assume any responsibility for the accuracy of the CUSIP data.

ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

The proceeds of the 2025DEF Bonds are expected to be applied as follows:

	2025D Bonds	2025E Bonds	2025F Bonds	Total 2025DEF Bonds
Sources of Funds				
Par Amount	$304,505,000.00	$133,480,000.00	$550,275,000.00	$988,260,000.00
Plus Net Original Issue Premium	5,465,419.05	5,524,737.20	58,523,311.35	69,513,467.60
Debt Service Fund Releases	--	--	6,177,707.88	6,177,707.88
Bond Reserve Account Releases	--	--	26,553,699.11	26,553,699.11
Total Sources	$309,970,419.05	$139,004,737.20	$641,529,718.34	$1,090,504,874.59
Uses of Funds				
Deposit to Project Fund[(1)]	$79,762,529.23	$12,599,992.22	--	$92,362,521.45
Refunding of Commercial Paper Notes	200,597,858.04	112,786,014.26	--	313,383,872.30
Redemption of Refunded Bonds	--	--	$639,886,299.16	639,886,299.16
Deposit to Capitalized Interest Accounts[(2)]	28,716,513.19	13,217,300.83	--	41,933,814.02
Costs of Issuance[(3)]	893,518.59	401,429.89	1,643,419.18	2,938,367.66
Total Uses	$309,970,419.05	$139,004,737.20	$641,529,718.34	$1,090,504,874.59

(1) Represents deposits to the respective Project Funds established under the Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture and Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture. See "PLAN OF FINANCE" and "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES."

(2) Represents deposits to respective Capitalized Interest Accounts established under the Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture and Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture.

(3) The costs of issuance include underwriters' discount and amounts for legal fees, Trustee and Escrow Agent fees, municipal advisor fees, Independent Pricing Consultant fees, Verification Agent fees, rating agency fees, printing costs, and other costs relating to the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds.

SECURITY FOR THE BONDS

Pledge of Revenues

General. Under the Indenture, the SFPUC has irrevocably pledged the Revenues of the Water Enterprise and all Refundable Credits (with respect to Bonds issued as Build America Bonds) received by the SFPUC to the punctual payment of principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds, including the 2025DEF Bonds and the Outstanding Bonds described below (see "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Outstanding Parity Revenue Bonds"), and any Additional Series of Bonds. This pledge is subject to the allocation of funds provided in the Indenture, as described below. See "– Flow of Funds."

Pursuant to Section 5451 of the California Government Code, the pledge of, lien on and security interest in Revenues and certain other funds granted by the Indenture is valid and binding in accordance with the terms thereof from the time of issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds without any further action by the SFPUC; the Revenues and such other funds shall be immediately subject to such pledge; and such pledge shall constitute a lien and security interest which shall immediately attach to such Revenues and other funds and shall be effective, binding and enforceable against the SFPUC, its successors, creditors, and all others asserting rights therein to the extent set forth and in accordance with the terms of the Indenture irrespective of whether those parties have notice of such pledge and without the need for any physical delivery, recordation, filing or other further act. Such pledge, lien and security interest are not subject to the provisions of Article 9 of the California Uniform Commercial Code.

Limited Obligation. THE SFPUC IS NOT OBLIGATED TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, OR INTEREST ON THE 2025DEF BONDS EXCEPT FROM REVENUES OF THE WATER ENTERPRISE. THE SFPUC HAS NO TAXING POWER. THE GENERAL FUND OF THE CITY IS NOT LIABLE FOR THE PAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, OR INTEREST ON THE 2025DEF BONDS, AND NEITHER THE CREDIT NOR THE TAXING POWER OF THE CITY IS PLEDGED TO THE PAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, OR INTEREST ON THE 2025DEF BONDS. THE 2025DEF BONDS ARE NOT SECURED BY A LEGAL OR EQUITABLE PLEDGE OF, OR CHARGE, LIEN OR ENCUMBRANCE UPON, ANY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE CITY OR OF THE SFPUC OR ANY OF ITS INCOME OR RECEIPTS, EXCEPT REVENUES OF THE WATER ENTERPRISE. THE 2025DEF BONDS ARE NOT SECURED BY THE REVENUES OF THE WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE OR THE POWER ENTERPRISE OR THE REVENUES OF CLEANPOWERSF.

Water Enterprise. The Indenture defines "**Enterprise**" (referred to in this Official Statement as the "**Water Enterprise**") as the whole and each and every part of the municipal water supply, storage and distribution system of the SFPUC, located partially within and partially outside of San Francisco, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and all additions, betterments and extensions to that water system. The Water Enterprise is defined to exclude any water supply, storage or distribution facilities under the jurisdiction of the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Project ("**Hetch Hetchy Water and Power**"), which consists of upcountry water supply and power generating facilities, including the Power Enterprise, all of which are also under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC. See "THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION – General" and "– Organization, Purposes and Powers."

Revenues. The Indenture defines "**Revenues**" as all gross revenues of the Water Enterprise, including all charges received for and all other income and receipts derived by the SFPUC or the City from the operation of the Water Enterprise, or arising from the Water Enterprise, including water connection and installation charges, but excluding:

(1) any money received by or for the account of the City or the SFPUC from the levy or collection of taxes;

(2) moneys received from the State of California (the "**State**") and the United States of America and required to be deposited in restricted funds;

(3) refundable deposits made to establish credit;

(4) advances and contributions made to the SFPUC or the City to be applied to construction;

(5) moneys required to be paid to the State and the United States of America pursuant to agreements with the City or the SFPUC;

(6) moneys received from insurance proceeds or the sale of or upon the taking by or under the threat of eminent domain of all or any part of the Water Enterprise;

(7) proceeds from Bonds issued by the SFPUC or proceeds from loans obtained by the SFPUC;

(8) moneys or securities received by the City or the SFPUC as gifts or grants, the use of which is restricted by the donor or grantor;

(9) sewer service fees or charges; and

(10) any surcharge imposed by, or upon the direction of any joint powers agency or other governmental entity, other than the SFPUC, the City or any department or agency of the City, whether or not collected by the SFPUC, the City or any department or agency of the City, for the purpose of financing improvements to the facilities comprising the Water Enterprise.

The term "**Revenues**" also includes (i) all interest, profits or other income derived from the deposit or investment of any moneys in any fund or account established under the Indenture (excluding any Rebate Fund and any escrow fund pledged for the payment of defeased bonds) or in any fund or account of the Water Enterprise and legally available to pay Debt Service on the Bonds, and (ii) any other moneys, proceeds and other amounts that the SFPUC determines should be "Revenues" under the Indenture.

Refundable Credits. The Indenture defines "**Refundable Credits**" as (a) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds under Section 54AA of the Code, the amounts which are payable by the federal government under Section 6431 of the Code, which the SFPUC has elected to receive under Section 54AA(g)(1) of the Code, and (b) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds under any other provisions of the Code that creates, in the determination of the SFPUC, a substantially similar direct-pay subsidy program, the amounts which are payable by the federal government under the applicable provisions of the Code, which the SFPUC has elected to receive under the applicable provisions of the Code. As described below under "– Rate Covenants – Debt Service Coverage," the SFPUC is permitted to include within the calculation of Revenues any Refundable Credits which are required or permitted to be made, taking into account federal sequestration legislation.

Flow of Funds

Deposits to Revenue Fund and Interest Fund. In accordance with the Charter, but subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of the Charter, the entire gross revenue of the Water Enterprise will be deposited into the Revenue Fund held by the Treasurer of the City (the "**Treasurer**"). The Treasurer will hold the amounts in the Revenue Fund separate from all other City funds. The SFPUC will transfer to the Trustee for deposit into the Interest Fund all Refundable Credits received by the SFPUC.

Application of Revenue Fund. The Treasurer will pay over to the Trustee all moneys in the Revenue Fund, after paying operation and maintenance expenses and making required deposits into pensions or other funds established with respect to SFPUC employees (as required by the Indenture), to the extent necessary to make the following deposits:

Interest. First, on or before the fifth Business Day preceding each interest payment date, the Treasurer is required to pay to the Trustee for deposit in the Interest Fund an amount equal to the sum of the following:

(1) The amount of interest becoming due and payable on the Outstanding Bonds of such Series that are Current Interest Bonds (except for Bonds constituting Variable Rate Indebtedness) on such interest payment date (less any amounts on deposit in such fund, including, but not limited to, Refundable Credits available to pay such interest, but excluding amounts on deposit which are reserved as capitalized interest to pay interest during any subsequent period); and

(2) 110% of the estimated aggregate amount of interest due on such interest payment date on the Outstanding Bonds of such Series that are Variable Rate Indebtedness. However, the amount required to be deposited to the Interest Fund for any period may be reduced by the amount by which the deposit in the prior period for interest estimated to accrue on Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness exceeded the actual amount of interest accrued during that period. Also, the amount required to be deposited into the Interest Fund for any period will be increased by the amount by which the deposit in the prior period for interest estimated to accrue on Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness was less than the actual amount of interest accruing during that period. Finally, the amount required to be deposited into the Interest Fund for any period will be reduced by any Refundable Credits on deposit in the Interest Fund and available to pay interest for such period.

No deposit needs to be made into the Interest Fund if the amount contained in that fund is at least equal to the interest to become due and payable on the next interest payment date upon all Bonds that are Outstanding (but excluding any moneys on deposit in the Interest Fund from the proceeds of any Series of Bonds or other source and reserved as capitalized interest to pay interest on any interest payment dates following said next interest payment date).

See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – REVENUES AND FUNDS – Establishment and Maintenance of Funds for Revenues; Use and Withdrawal of Revenues – Interest Fund, Refundable Credits."

Moneys in the Interest Fund will be used and withdrawn by the Trustee solely to pay the interest on the Bonds as it becomes due and payable (including accrued interest on any Bonds purchased or redeemed prior to maturity under the Indenture).

Principal. Second, on or before the fifth Business Day preceding each principal payment date, the Treasurer is required to pay to the Trustee for deposit in the Principal Fund an amount equal to the sum of the following:

(1) the aggregate amount of Bond Obligation of such Series (less any amounts on deposit in such fund) becoming due and payable on such principal payment date, plus

(2) the Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments required to be made with respect to any Term Bonds of such Series on such principal payment date, plus

(3) if any Letter of Credit Agreement has been entered into on parity with the Bonds, sufficient amounts to pay the obligations of the SFPUC under the Letter of Credit Agreement due on such principal payment date.

If the amounts on deposit in the Principal Fund are insufficient to make all deposits required to be made with respect to any principal payment date, such amounts will be applied on a Proportionate Basis and in such proportion as the Serial Bonds, the Minimum Sinking Fund Payments for Term Bonds, and the Letter of Credit Agreement obligations shall bear to each other. See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – REVENUES AND FUNDS – Establishment and Maintenance of Funds for Revenues; Use and Withdrawal of Revenues – Principal Fund; Sinking Fund Accounts."

Bond Reserve Fund. Third, in the event of any withdrawal from any Bond Reserve Account, the Treasurer is required to pay to the Trustee for deposit in such Bond Reserve Account, on a *pari passu* basis with transfers to any other Bond Reserve Account, on or before the fifth Business Day preceding each interest payment date following such withdrawal, an amount sufficient to replenish any prior withdrawal from such Bond Reserve Account, either in two semi-annual installments for Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to fixed rate Bonds only or in equal installments over a 12-month period for Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to any Variable Rate Bonds, so that the balance in such Bond Reserve Account is equal to the Required Reserve with respect to the applicable Series of Bonds (or such larger balance as may be required by any Supplemental Indenture) at the end of such 12-month period.

If a Bond Reserve Fund Policy satisfies all or a portion of the Required Reserve for any Series of Bonds and a drawing is made on the Bond Reserve Fund Policy, on or before the fifth Business Day prior to each interest payment date following such drawing, the Treasurer must pay, either in two semi-annual installments for Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to fixed rate Bonds only or in equal installments over a 12-month period for Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to any Variable Rate Bonds, an amount sufficient to repay the aggregate amount of Policy Costs owing with respect to such drawing by the end of such 12-month period to the Reserve Provider (as defined in the Indenture) or to the Trustee (who will remit the payment to the Reserve Provider). See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE."

Funds or a Bond Reserve Fund Policy on deposit in a Bond Reserve Account will be applied solely to the payment of the Series of Bonds to which such Bond Reserve Account relates and will not be available for payment for any other Series of Bonds. **No Bond Reserve Account has been established with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds.**

Rate Covenants

Sufficiency of Revenues. The SFPUC has covenanted in the Indenture that it will, at all times while any of the Bonds remain Outstanding, establish, fix, prescribe and collect rates, fees and charges in connection with the water, services and facilities furnished by the Water Enterprise so as to yield Revenues at least sufficient, after making reasonable allowances for contingencies and errors in the estimates, to pay the following amounts:

(1) the interest on and principal of the Bonds as they become due and payable (but not including any interest moneys for the payment of which have been deposited in the Interest Fund from the proceeds of any Series of Bonds or from any other source);

(2) all other payments required for compliance with the terms of the Indenture and of any Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of Additional Series of Bonds pursuant to the Indenture;

(3) all other payments to meet any other obligations of the SFPUC which are charges, liens or encumbrances upon, or payable from, the Revenues; and

(4) all current Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise (but not including such Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise as are scheduled to be paid by the SFPUC from moneys other than Revenues, such money to be clearly available for such purpose).

Debt Service Coverage. In addition to the requirements set forth in "– Sufficiency of Revenues" above, the Indenture provides that the SFPUC will, at all times while any of the Bonds remain Outstanding, establish, fix, prescribe and collect rates, fees and charges in connection with the water, services and facilities furnished by the Water Enterprise so as to yield Net Revenues for the twelve months following the date of calculation, which (together with any fund balances of the SFPUC or the Water Enterprise legally available for payment of Debt Service and not budgeted to be expended during such twelve months but excluding the Bond Reserve Fund and Rebate Fund) are equal to at least 1.25 times Annual Debt Service for such twelve-month period, but from such Annual Debt Service excluding any funded interest.

For the purpose of calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, and Average Annual Debt Service, in determining the amount of interest coming due during any twelve-month period ending June 30 on any Series of Bonds that were issued as Build America Bonds, such amount will be reduced by an amount equal to the Refundable Credits the SFPUC is scheduled to receive during each such twelve-month period ending June 30, taking into account the federal sequestration legislation described below. To avoid double counting, Refundable Credits used as a credit against Debt Service are not included in the calculation of Revenues for any purpose under the Indenture. See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – DEFINITIONS – Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, Average Annual Debt Service."

Pursuant to federal sequestration legislation passed by Congress in 2011 and 2013, federal subsidy payments for direct pay bonds, including Build America Bonds, have been reduced (by formula) from the original funding subsidy level of 35% of interest costs on direct pay bonds, including Build America Bonds. The current sequestration reduction rate of the federal subsidy payment for Build America Bonds is 5.7% (or a net subsidy level of 33.005% of interest costs on Build America Bonds), which rate will remain in effect through September 30, 2031, unless changed by legislation. Refundable credits sought by the SFPUC for its Build America Bonds have been and are expected to be reduced by this percentage. This reduction has and will increase the SFPUC's net interest cost. In Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24, the SFPUC received approximately $21.2 million and $20.1 million, respectively, in Refundable Credits for the Water Enterprise, approximately 3.0% and 2.9%, respectively, of total revenues in such years. Congress can terminate, extend, or otherwise modify reductions in federal subsidy payments due to sequestration at any time. The SFPUC can give no assurance regarding the level of federal subsidy payments or changes in the sequestration rate, if any, in the future.

The 2010B Bonds and the 2010E Bonds, issued as Build America Bonds, will be refunded by the 2025F Bonds, which will eliminate a portion of the Refundable Credits received by the SFPUC. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

Proposed Amendments to Indenture. The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture includes amendments to the Indenture impacting the SFPUC's rate covenant. See "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE."

Net Revenues and Operation and Maintenance Costs. "**Net Revenues**" and "**Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise**" are defined as follows:

The term "**Net Revenues**" is defined in the Indenture as:

- all of the Revenues (but not including interest on investment of funds required to be deposited in said funds or investment earnings required to be deposited in the Improvement Fund) less

- all Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise (but not including such Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise as are scheduled to be paid by the SFPUC from moneys other than Revenues, such moneys to be clearly available for such purpose).

The Indenture defines the term "**Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise**" as the reasonable and necessary costs of operating and maintaining the Water Enterprise, calculated on sound accounting principles, including (among other things) salaries and wages, fees for services, costs of materials, supplies and fuel, reasonable expenses of management, legal fees, accounting fees, repairs and other expenses necessary to maintain and preserve the Water Enterprise in good repair and working order, and reasonable amounts for administration, overhead, insurance, taxes (if any), other similar costs, and the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the SFPUC may establish or the Board of Supervisors may require with respect to employees of the SFPUC.

"**Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise**" exclude in all cases the following:

(1) depreciation and obsolescence charges or reserves therefor,

(2) amortization of intangibles or other bookkeeping entries of a similar nature,

(3) costs of capital additions, replacements, betterments, extensions or improvements to the Water Enterprise, which under generally accepted accounting principles are chargeable to a capital account or to a reserve for depreciation, and

(4) charges for the payment of principal and interest on any general obligation bonds, revenue bonds or other indebtedness heretofore or hereafter issued for Water Enterprise purposes.

See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – DEFINITIONS."

No Bond Reserve Account for the 2025DEF Bonds

The Indenture establishes the Bond Reserve Fund and requires the establishment of a bond reserve account (each, a "**Bond Reserve Account**") within the Bond Reserve Fund for each Series of Bonds issued under the Indenture, if and to the extent required by a Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which that Series of Bonds is issued, and requires the deposit in each Bond Reserve Account of an amount equal to the Required Reserve for the related Series of Bonds. Each Bond Reserve Account is available only for the payment of debt service on the Series of Bonds for which such Bond Reserve Account was established.

Pursuant to the Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, the Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture and the Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture, no Bond Reserve Account has been established for the 2025D Bonds, the 2025E Bonds or the 2025F Bonds, respectively. The Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to other Series of Bonds do not secure, and will not be available for, the 2025DEF Bonds.

Additional Series of Bonds

Additional Series of Bonds Test in the Indenture. The Indenture provides that Additional Series of Bonds secured by Revenues on parity with the Outstanding Bonds and the 2025DEF Bonds may be issued if certain conditions are met, including the SFPUC's delivery to the Trustee of the following documents (among others):

(1) A certificate of the SFPUC setting forth the following:

(a) Net Revenues for any period of twelve consecutive calendar months out of the eighteen calendar months next preceding the authentication and delivery of the Additional Series of Bonds, and

(b) the Debt Service for such 12-month period, and demonstrating that for such 12-month period Net Revenues equaled at least 1.25 times the Debt Service.

(2) If any portion of the proceeds of such Additional Series of Bonds is to be used to finance construction, a certificate of the Consulting Engineers setting forth:

(a) the estimated date of completion for the portion of the Project for which such Additional Series of Bonds is being issued and for any other uncompleted portion of the Project, and

(b) an estimate of the cost of construction of such portion of the Project and of any other uncompleted portion of the Project.

(3) A written report of a Qualified Independent Consultant setting forth estimates for each of the next three Fiscal Years of:

(a) Revenues,

(b) Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise, and

(c) Net Revenues,

if any portion of the proceeds of such Additional Series of Bonds is to be used to finance construction, the estimate will be made for the three Fiscal Years following the Fiscal Year in which the Consulting Engineers estimate such portion of the Project will be completed.

(4) A certificate of the SFPUC setting forth the following:

(a) the estimates of Net Revenues provided by the Qualified Independent Consultant pursuant to paragraph (3) above for each of such three Fiscal Years, and

(b) the Annual Debt Service for such three Fiscal Years (including estimated Annual Debt Service for future Additional Series of Bonds, if any), that will be required to complete payment of any uncompleted portion of the Project (based on the estimate of the Consulting Engineers), which certificate demonstrates that the estimated Net Revenues in each of such three Fiscal Years is at least equal to 1.25 times the Annual Debt Service for the corresponding Fiscal Year.

Such certificate may anticipate projected rates not yet enacted and such certificate and the certificate delivered pursuant to clause (1) may also include as an offset to Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise any such costs which are scheduled to be paid from moneys other than Revenues which are clearly available for such purpose, and include as Revenues any other moneys, proceeds and other amounts that the SFPUC determines should be "Revenues" under the Indenture.

All certificates and written reports will be based upon the actual interest rate or rates determined at the time the Additional Series of Bonds are sold.

Proposed Amendments to Indenture. The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture includes amendments to the Indenture impacting the requirements for the issuance of an Additional Series of Bonds to finance projects. See "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE."

Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds with Consent of Bond Owners and Credit Provider. The Indenture also provides that Additional Series of Bonds may be issued without compliance with any of the requirements described above with the written consent of Owners of a majority of the aggregate Bond Obligations of Bonds Outstanding and any Credit Provider, if applicable. See "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE." Any Additional Series of Bonds issued under this provision would, however, be subject to the requirements for issuing revenue bonds under the Charter. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Authority for Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Other Obligations Payable from Revenues."

Refunding Bonds

Indenture Requirements. The Indenture provides that Additional Series of Bonds may be issued to refund any Bonds, including the 2025DEF Bonds, without meeting the test for the issuance of Additional Series of Bonds described above, if the SFPUC delivers to the Trustee (among other documents) a certificate of an Independent Certified Public Accountant to the effect that the Average Annual Debt Service for the Additional Series of Bonds will be equal to or less than the Average Annual Debt Service on the Bonds to be refunded.

Proposed Amendments to Indenture. The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture includes amendments to the Indenture impacting the requirements for the issuance of an Additional Series of Bonds for refunding purposes. See "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE."

Other Parity Obligations; Subordinate Obligations; Obligations Not Payable from Revenues

The Indenture permits the SFPUC to incur obligations payable from Revenues and Refundable Credits on a parity with the payment of principal of and interest on the Bonds upon satisfaction of the requirements set forth in the Indenture. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans" and "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Additional Series of Bonds."

The Indenture permits the SFPUC to authorize and issue bonds, notes, warrants, certificates or other obligations or evidences of indebtedness, the principal of or interest on which would be payable either (i) from Revenues after and subordinate to the payment from Revenues of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, or (ii) from moneys which are not Revenues. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Subordinate Debt and Interim Funding Program" and "– Corps Water Infrastructure Financing Program."

Investments

The Indenture provides that moneys in all funds and accounts held by the Trustee under the Indenture shall be invested upon receipt in time or demand deposits (including certificates of deposit) in any bank or trust company (including the Trustee) authorized to accept deposits of public funds, and may be invested in Permitted Investments (as defined in Appendix A) as directed by the SFPUC, and all accounts funds and accounts held by the Treasurer shall be invested in Legal Investments. "**Legal Investments**" means any bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, bills, acceptances or other securities in which the Treasurer may legally invest the SFPUC's funds. For information regarding the investment of moneys held in the various funds and accounts of the SFPUC, see "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Investment of SFPUC Funds."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE

The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture amends and supplements certain provisions of the Indenture, effective when the written consents of the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding and each Credit Provider, if any, have been filed with the Trustee and certain other requirements under the Indenture have been satisfied. Approximately 32.8% of the aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds currently Outstanding have been obtained. **By their purchase of the 2025DEF Bonds, purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds irrevocably agree to, accept and consent to the provisions of such amendments for all purposes of the Indenture**. Upon the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, approximately 50.8% of the aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding will have been obtained.

The proposed amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture include, among others, amendments to the Indenture provisions relating to the calculation of "Maximum Annual Debt Service," "Annual Debt Service," "Average Annual Debt Service," the incurrence of "Parity Loans," the conditions under which Additional Series of Bonds may be issued, the filing of annual audited financial information with the Trustee and the rate covenants. For a description of the proposed amendments set forth in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, see "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE."

OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES

Authority for Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Other Obligations Payable from Revenues

City Charter. The Charter authorizes the SFPUC to issue revenue bonds and commercial paper notes and to incur other obligations payable from or secured by a pledge of Revenues. The Charter requires voter approval of revenue bonds issued by the SFPUC unless a specific exception to the voter approval requirement applies. See "– Reconstruction or Replacement of Existing Facilities" and "– Refunding Bonds."

Proposition A. On November 5, 2002, voters of the City approved Proposition A ("**Proposition A**"), specifically authorizing the issuance of up to $1.628 billion of revenue bonds for the purpose of funding the SFPUC's Water Enterprise capital improvement program. The SFPUC has previously issued approximately $1.499 billion aggregate principal amount of Bonds pursuant to such Proposition A authorization.

Proposition E. Section 8B.124 of the Charter, enacted by voters of the City on November 5, 2002 as part of Proposition E ("**Proposition E**"), authorizes the SFPUC to issue revenue bonds, including notes, commercial paper or other forms of indebtedness, when authorized by ordinance approved by two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, for purposes of reconstructing, replacing, expanding, repairing or improving water facilities or clean water facilities or combinations of water and clean water facilities under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC and to refund such bonds.

Proposition E also authorizes the Board of Supervisors to take any and all actions necessary to authorize, issue and repay such revenue bonds, including, but not limited to, modifying schedules of rates and charges to provide for the payment and retirement of such revenue bonds. Issuance of such revenue bonds is subject to the following additional conditions set forth in Proposition E:

(a) Certification by an independent engineer retained by the SFPUC that:

(1) the projects to be financed by the revenue bonds, including the prioritization, cost estimates and scheduling, meet utility standards; and

(2) estimated net revenues after payment of operating and maintenance expenses will be sufficient to meet debt service coverage and other indenture or resolution requirements, including debt service on the revenue bonds to be issued, and estimated repair and replacement costs.

(b) Certification by the San Francisco Planning Department that facilities under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC funded with such bonds will comply with applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("**CEQA**").

Any ordinance approving bonds (except for refunding bonds) adopted pursuant to Proposition E will become effective 30 days after its adoption unless it is opposed through the referendum process. Opposition may be made by filing with the Board of Supervisors a petition protesting the passage of that ordinance. Such petition must be signed by voters in a number equal to at least 10% of the votes cast for all candidates for Mayor in the last preceding general municipal election for Mayor. If a referendum passes, the ordinance is suspended from becoming effective. The Board of Supervisors may reconsider the ordinance. If it is not entirely repealed, the Board of Supervisors is required to submit the ordinance to voters at the next general municipal or statewide election or at a special municipal election and it will not become effective until approved by voters at such an election.

Reconstruction or Replacement of Existing Facilities. Section 9.107(6) of the Charter provides that no voter approval is required for bonds issued for the purpose of the reconstruction or replacement of existing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors.

Refunding Bonds. Section 9.109 of the Charter authorizes the Board of Supervisors to provide for the issuance of bonds for the purpose of refunding revenue bonds without voter approval if the issuance and sale of such refunding bonds are expected to result in net debt service savings on a present value basis, calculated as provided by ordinance. An ordinance that was passed by the Board of Supervisors on June 18, 2024, authorizes and approves the issuance by the SFPUC of refunding bonds and other forms of indebtedness provided that each such refunding bond issue is permitted under the applicable policies and procedures of the City and authorized by the Charter. Refunding bonds may be issued without limitation as to principal amount if: (i) three percent (3%) net present value debt service savings or greater is achieved to ensure ratepayer savings; (ii) the maturity of the refunded bonds is not extended, provided that principal payments and term may be adjusted, where permitted under federal and state tax law, only if and when the underlying capital asset funded through said refunded bonds has a useful life not in excess of any limit permitted under federal and state tax law than the refunded term; (iii) the authorization is subject to a five-year term through June 30, 2029, at which time the Board of Supervisors may consider an extension; (iv) principal payments and term may be adjusted, where permitted under federal and state tax law, only if and when the underlying capital asset funded through said refunded bonds has a useful life not in excess of any limit permitted under federal and state tax law than the refunded term; and (v) the SFPUC will within 30 days of any executed refunding transaction provide a savings report prepared by its municipal advisors to the Board of Supervisors, together with a copy of the final official statement with respect to such series of refunding bonds.

Alternatively, Proposition E authorizes the Board of Supervisors to provide for the issuance of refunding bonds without voter approval pursuant to ordinance and subject to the terms of Proposition E. The 2025F Bonds will be issued by the SFPUC pursuant to authority granted by Proposition E and ordinances adopted thereunder.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Outstanding Parity Revenue Bonds

All Bonds in the table below (the "**Outstanding Bonds**") have been issued pursuant to the Indenture and secured by a pledge of Revenues on parity with the 2025DEF Bonds.

Series of Bonds	Purpose	Principal Amount Outstanding as of May 1, 2025
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series ABC [1][2]	Water system improvements under Proposition E	$309,420,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series DE [2][3]	Water system improvements under Proposition E	304,680,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series FG [2][4]	Water system improvements under Proposition E	351,470,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2016 Series AB (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	492,110,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2016 Series C	Water system improvements under Proposition E	212,895,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2017 Series DEFG (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	236,370,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2019 Series ABC (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	347,365,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2020 Series ABCD	Water system improvements under Proposition A and Proposition E	346,760,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2020 Series EFGH (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	373,825,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2023 Series AB	Water system improvements under Proposition A and Proposition E	414,035,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2023 Series CD (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	514,855,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series ABC (Refunding)	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	523,435,000
Total		$4,427,220,000

(1) The San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Sub-Series A and 2010 Sub-Series C are no longer outstanding.

(2) The 2010B Bonds, 2010E Bonds and the SFPUC's San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series FG, 2010 Sub-Series G (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment) (the "**2010G Bonds**") were issued as Build America Bonds. All of the outstanding 2010B Bonds and 2010E Bonds will be refunded by the 2025F Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE – Refunded Bonds."

(3) The San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Sub-Series D are no longer outstanding.

(4) The San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Sub-Series F are no longer outstanding.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Parity State Loans

The SFPUC has entered into an Installment Sale Agreement and Grant (the "**CWSRF Agreement**") with the State Water Resources Control Board ("**SWRCB**") to finance a portion of the cost of the SFPUC's San Francisco Westside Recycled Water Project (the "**Westside Recycled Water Project**"), a Water Enterprise recycled water project expected to satisfy the drought mitigation financing criteria and Proposition 1 grant guidelines of the SWRCB's Water Recycling Funding Program. The CWSRF Agreement was entered into pursuant to the SWRCB's Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan Program.

The CWSRF Agreement, most recently amended in April 2023, provides for a $15,000,000 grant and a $176,094,031 loan (the "**CWSRF Loan**"). The CWSRF Loan has a 30-year, level amortizing fixed interest rate loan bearing interest at a rate of 1% per annum. Repayment of the CWSRF Loan will begin in October 2025, one year after the estimated construction completion date of the Westside Recycled Water Project set forth in the loan agreement. The SFPUC's obligation to repay the CWSRF Loan will be payable from and secured by a pledge of the Revenues of the Water Enterprise on a parity with the pledge and lien of the Indenture securing payment of principal of and interest on the Bonds. As of May 1, 2025, the SFPUC had submitted requests for reimbursement for approximately $174.7 million. In connection with the execution and delivery of the CWSRF Agreement, the SFPUC adopted the Twenty-Fourth Supplemental Indenture which amended the Indenture to clarify the status of "Parity State Loans", defined as "loan agreements or installment sale agreements entered into between the SFPUC and the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof) to finance additions, betterments, extensions, repairs, renewals or replacements to the Water Enterprise which, by their terms, are payable from Revenues on a parity basis with debt service on the Bonds", as "evidences of indebtedness" within the meaning of the term "Bond" for certain purposes of the Indenture, and to make other technical amendments to facilitate the repayment of the CWSRF Loan on a parity with the payment of debt service on the Bonds.

The SFPUC has entered into a loan agreement (the "**DWSRF Loan**") with the SWRCB to finance the cost of the SFPUC's Mountain Tunnel Project pursuant to the SWRCB's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program. The DWSRF Loan provides for up to $238.219 million in borrowing and has a 30-year, level amortizing fixed interest rate at a rate of 1.10% per annum. Repayment of the DWSRF Loan will begin one year after the estimated construction completion date of the Mountain Tunnel Project, which is expected to occur in 2026. The SFPUC's obligation to repay the DWSRF Loan will be payable from and secured by a pledge of Revenues of the Water Enterprise on a parity with the pledge and lien of the Indenture securing payment of principal of and interest on the Bonds and the SFPUC's obligation to repay the CWSRF Loan. As of May 1, 2025, the SFPUC had submitted requests for reimbursements for approximately $117.2 million. See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Hetch Hetchy Water."

In September 2023, the SFPUC completed submission of an application for an additional State Revolving Fund loan to finance the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Ozone Project, estimated to cost $214 million. This project includes the construction of new ozone facilities (liquid oxygen and nitrogen facility, ozone generation building, ozone contactor structure, open loop cooling water pump station and calcium thiosulfate facility) and other supportive improvements such as yard piping, a new access road, and electrical work. This project is currently in the pre-construction phase. The SWRCB approved the list of new projects selected for State Fiscal Year 2024-25 in August 2024, which included $50 million in SRF loan financing for the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Ozone Project. Inclusion on such list does not, however, constitute a financing commitment, a guarantee that sufficient funds from the anticipated sources of funds will be available, or a determination of eligibility. Any such funding would take the form of a loan from the SWRCB to the SFPUC, constituting a Parity State Loan.

In September 2024, the SFPUC completed submission of an application for an additional State Revolving Fund loan to finance the As-Needed Water Service Line Replacement Project (also known as the Lead Component Services Program), estimated to cost $38.5 million. This project includes the replacement of approximately 1,400 existing 2-inch and smaller galvanized water service lines and lead whips with new copper pipes. This project is currently in the construction phase. The SWRCB included this project in their list of priority projects for State Fiscal Year 2022-23 and for State fiscal year 2023-24. The SFPUC is seeking approval to complete and submit the remaining portions of the application. Inclusion on such lists does not, however, constitute a financing commitment, a guarantee that sufficient funds from the anticipated sources of funds will be available, or a determination of eligibility. Any such funding would take the form of a loan from the SWRCB to the SFPUC, constituting a Parity State Loan.

Proposed Amendments to Indenture. The Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture includes amendments to the Indenture impacting the requirements for additional Parity State Loans and includes amendments to the Indenture allowing loans from the federal government (or any board, department or agency thereof), upon satisfaction of certain conditions, to be payable from Revenues on a parity with the Bonds. See "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INDENTURE" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE – FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE."

Corps Water Infrastructure Financing Program

In December 2023, the SFPUC submitted a pre-application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a Corps Water Infrastructure Financing Program ("**CWIFP**") loan to finance a collection of eight Water Enterprise projects supporting dam safety and resilience. These projects are designed to assess the condition of critical dams in the SFPUC's Regional Water System and to repair, rehabilitate, or replace related facilities if needed. Project objectives include upgrading dams to ensure structural safety, allowing for safe passage of flood events, providing water and hydropower reliability, and safeguarding the environment and economic opportunity. All projects are currently in varying stages of planning and design.

In September 2024, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers notified the SFPUC that its pre-application was selected to submit a full application for CWIFP financing consideration for a loan up to $614,811,376. Invitation to submit a full application for CWIFP financing assistance does not guarantee the program will proceed to financial close. The SFPUC plans to submit the full application prior to the deadline of September 9, 2025.

The SFPUC anticipates that any CWIFP loan would be payable from Revenues on a basis subordinate to the payment of debt service on the Bonds.

The SFPUC has no current loan obligations with respect to the Water Enterprise payable to the federal government from Revenues.

Contingent Payment Obligations

The Water Enterprise has no interest rate swaps, caps or hedges or other contingent payment obligations payable from Revenues. The Water Enterprise may in the future, however, incur contingent payment obligations payable from Revenues. Such contingent payment obligations may be payable on parity with the 2025DEF Bonds if the conditions for the issuance of parity debt under the Indenture are met. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Additional Series of Bonds."

Subordinate Debt and Interim Funding Program

Interim Funding Program. The SFPUC has established an Interim Funding Program (the "**Interim Funding Program**") (formerly known as the "Commercial Paper Program") to fund construction costs relating to capital projects. See "FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS."

The Interim Funding Program is authorized for the Water Enterprise in the aggregate principal amount of $750 million. Of this amount, $550 million is authorized for the SFPUC to issue tax-exempt and taxable commercial paper notes ("**Commercial Paper Notes**") secured by separate bank credit facilities, as set forth below. The remaining $200 million of the Interim Funding Program is in the form of separate bank revolving credit agreements, as set forth below. Each revolving credit agreement permits the SFPUC to make draws directly from the respective bank, with the SFPUC's payment obligation evidenced by a tax-exempt revolving note and a taxable revolving note (the "**Revolving Notes**").

The Commercial Paper Notes and the Revolving Notes are payable from Revenues, and are secured on a parity lien basis with each other. The Commercial Paper Notes and the Revolving Notes, collectively, are secured on a basis subordinate to the payment of debt service on the Bonds.

The Commercial Paper Notes are secured by (i) a $200 million letter of credit from Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation, acting through its New York Branch, which expires on June 14, 2027, (ii) a $100 million letter of credit from Barclays Bank PLC which expires on July 15, 2027, (iii) a $150 million letter of credit from PNC Bank National Association which expires on February 17, 2028, and (iv) a $100 million letter of credit from Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation, acting through its New York Branch, which expires on February 15, 2030. BofA Securities, Inc., J.P. Morgan Securities LLC and Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, serve as dealers for the Commercial Paper Notes.

The Revolving Notes were issued pursuant to (i) a $100 million revolving credit agreement with U.S. Bank National Association which expires on July 16, 2027, and (ii) a combined revolving credit agreement with Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, $100 million of which is allocated to the Water Enterprise's Revolving Notes, which expires on March 3, 2028.

As of May 28, 2025, the SFPUC had tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $312.4 million, taxable Commercial Paper Notes outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $20.0 million and no amount outstanding under the Revolving Notes. All of the outstanding tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes will be refunded with proceeds of the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

Other Subordinate Obligations Payable from Revenues

The SFPUC completed the construction of a 13-story office building at 525 Golden Gate Avenue in San Francisco to house the administrative offices of the SFPUC's three utility enterprises and moved into the building in July 2012. Total project costs were approximately $202 million and were financed with land and property sale proceeds, fund balances, grants and the proceeds of certificates of participation (the "**2009 Golden Gate COPs**"), representing interests in a City General Fund lease, executed and delivered in two series (one of which constitutes Build America Bonds) on October 7, 2009, in the aggregate principal amount of $167,670,000. The final maturity date of the 2009 Golden Gate COPs is November 1, 2041. As of May 1, 2025, the principal amount outstanding of the 2009 Golden Gate COPs was $120.2 million. Pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the SFPUC, the SFPUC will reimburse the City General Fund for all debt service in connection with this City financing (net of Refundable Credits received). The SFPUC allocates such payment obligations internally among its three utility enterprises based on percentage facility usage. The Water Enterprise has been allocated 71.4% of such obligations, payable from Revenues on a basis subordinate to the payment of principal of and interest on the Bonds and any parity State or federal loans.

Revenue Bond Oversight Committee; Audit of Bond Expenditures

In November 2002, San Francisco voters adopted Proposition P, an ordinance that established the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee ("RBOC") to report to the Mayor, the SFPUC and the Board of Supervisors regarding the expenditure of revenue bond proceeds issued by the SFPUC's Water Enterprise, Wastewater Enterprise and Power Enterprise (each as defined herein). Together with the City Services Auditor and outside auditors, RBOC initiated a three-phase performance audit of select revenue bonds issued by the SFPUC. The audit report for the first phase, completed in February 2022, found that revenue bond expenditures were spent appropriately and made recommendations that the SFPUC subsequently implemented. The audit report for the second phase, completed in August 2023, also found that revenue bond expenditures were spent appropriately, with minor exceptions totaling less than 1.5% of audited expenditures, and made several recommendations regarding procurement practices and oversight. The third phase is currently ongoing. The provisions of the ordinance establishing RBOC expired on January 1, 2025, and RBOC no longer exists. The SFPUC anticipates that the audit report for the third phase will be completed by the City Services Auditor later in 2025. The SFPUC is evaluating options for conducting annual audits of the SFPUC's revenue bond proceeds moving forward.

Debt Service Requirements

Set forth in the following table are debt service requirements on the Outstanding Bonds, the 2025DEF Bonds and Parity Obligations.

DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS ON
OUTSTANDING BONDS, 2025DEF BONDS AND PARITY OBLIGATIONS

Fiscal Year (ending June 30)	Outstanding Bonds[1][2][3]	2025D Bonds Principal	2025D Bonds Interest[2]	2025E Bonds Principal	2025E Bonds Interest[2]	2025F Bonds Principal	2025F Bonds Interest	Other Parity Obligations[4]	Total Debt Service[5]
2025	$331,133,814	--	--	--	--	--	--	$2,246,093	$333,379,907
2026	292,683,592	--	--	--	--	$20,415,000	$23,691,402	9,369,000	346,158,994
2027	291,048,622	--	--	--	--	24,585,000	25,676,975	9,418,900	350,729,498
2028	288,612,995	--	$15,225,250	--	$7,007,700	25,810,000	24,417,100	9,452,785	370,525,829
2029	295,150,304	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	27,095,000	23,094,475	16,198,462	383,771,191
2030	295,192,945	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	28,445,000	21,705,975	16,198,462	383,775,331
2031	295,234,337	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	29,865,000	20,248,225	16,198,462	383,778,974
2032	295,149,922	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	31,355,000	18,717,725	16,198,462	383,654,059
2033	288,811,128	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	32,915,000	17,110,975	16,198,462	377,268,514
2034	286,966,028	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	34,560,000	15,424,100	16,198,462	375,381,540
2035	286,725,723	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	36,280,000	13,653,100	16,198,462	375,090,235
2036	286,474,200	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	38,095,000	11,793,725	16,198,462	374,794,336
2037	286,213,762	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	39,995,000	9,841,475	16,198,462	374,481,648
2038	269,377,527	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	41,990,000	7,791,850	16,198,462	357,590,788
2039	264,893,130	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	44,085,000	5,639,975	16,198,462	353,049,516
2040	264,357,376	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	46,285,000	3,380,725	16,198,462	352,454,513
2041	213,812,834	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	48,500,000	1,111,800	16,198,462	301,856,045
2042	213,331,822	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	251,763,234
2043	171,777,468	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	210,208,880
2044	171,341,630	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	209,773,042
2045	134,633,145	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	173,064,556
2046	134,634,946	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	173,066,358
2047	134,637,699	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	173,069,110
2048	134,634,907	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	173,066,319
2049	136,844,441	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	175,275,853
2050	136,843,445	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	175,274,857
2051	136,848,513	--	15,225,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	175,279,924
2052	29,489,294	$60,440,000	13,714,250	--	7,007,700	--	--	16,198,462	126,849,706
2053	29,489,294	32,785,000	11,383,625	$30,790,000	6,199,463	--	--	16,198,462	126,845,843
2054	--	64,715,000	8,946,125	32,450,000	4,539,413	--	--	16,198,462	126,848,999
2055	--	68,030,000	5,627,500	34,200,000	2,789,850	--	--	16,198,462	126,845,812
2056	--	78,535,000	1,963,375	36,040,000	946,050	--	--	9,366,086	126,850,511
2057	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9,366,086	9,366,086
2058	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9,366,086	9,366,086
Total[5]	$6,396,344,839	$304,505,000	$407,040,875	$133,480,000	$189,667,275	$550,275,000	$243,299,602	$495,943,503	$8,720,556,094

(1) Comprised of debt service relating to the Outstanding Bonds upon the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds. Does not include debt service on Refunded Bonds. See "– Outstanding Parity Revenue Bonds" and "PLAN OF FINANCE."

(2) Net of capitalized interest payments. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

(3) Calculation of interest due on Outstanding Bonds shown without an offset for Refundable Credits. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Pledge of Revenues – Refundable Credits" and " – Rate Covenants."

(4) Consists of debt service on the full principal amount of the CWSRF Loan and DWSRF Loan. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans."

(5) Totals may not add due to rounding.

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS PROVIDED FOR CONVENIENCE ONLY. THE GENERAL FUND OF THE CITY IS NOT LIABLE FOR THE PAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, OR INTEREST ON THE 2025DEF BONDS, AND NEITHER THE CREDIT NOR THE TAXING POWER OF THE CITY IS PLEDGED TO THE PAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, OR INTEREST ON THE 2025DEF BONDS. THE 2025DEF BONDS ARE NOT SECURED BY A LEGAL OR EQUITABLE PLEDGE OF, OR CHARGE, LIEN, OR ENCUMBRANCE UPON, ANY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE CITY.

General. San Francisco is the economic and cultural center of the San Francisco Bay Area and northern California. The limits of San Francisco encompass over 93 square miles, of which 49 square miles are land, with the balance consisting of tidelands and a portion of the San Francisco Bay. San Francisco is located at the northern tip of the San Francisco Peninsula, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the San Francisco Bay and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to the east, the entrance to the San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge to the north, and San Mateo County to the south. Silicon Valley is about an hour's drive to the south, and the Napa-Sonoma wine country is about an hour's drive to the north. The California Department of Finance estimates San Francisco's population as of January 1, 2024 was 843,071 (a decrease of 3.5% from 873,965 as of April 1, 2020).

The San Francisco Bay Area consists of the nine counties contiguous to the Bay: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma Counties (collectively, the "**Bay Area**"). The economy of the Bay Area includes a wide range of industries, supplying local needs as well as the needs of national and international markets. Major business sectors in the Bay Area include technology, retail, entertainment and the arts, conventions and tourism, service businesses, banking, professional and financial services, corporate headquarters, international and wholesale trade, multimedia and advertising, healthcare, higher education and agriculture. The California State Supreme Court is also based in San Francisco.

San Francisco benefits from a highly skilled, educated and professional labor force. The City estimates the per-capita personal income of San Francisco for fiscal year 2023-24 was $167,542. The San Francisco Unified School District ("**SFUSD**"), which is a separate legal entity from the City, operates approximately 64 elementary schools, 13 middle schools, 14 high schools, 11 early education schools, six County and Court schools, three continuation schools, and 11 charter schools as of the 2024-25 academic year. Higher education institutions located in San Francisco include the University of San Francisco, California State University – San Francisco, University of California – San Francisco (a medical school and health science campus), the UC College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly University of California Hastings College of the Law), the University of the Pacific's School of Dentistry, Golden Gate University, City College of San Francisco (a public community college), the California College of the Arts, the San Francisco Conservatory of Music, and the Academy of Art University.

San Francisco International Airport ("**SFO**"), located 14 miles south of downtown San Francisco in an unincorporated area of San Mateo County, is owned by the City and is operated by the San Francisco Airport Commission (the "**Airport Commission**"), and is a principal commercial service airport for the Bay Area and one of the nation's principal gateways for Pacific Rim traffic. San Francisco is also served by the Bay Area Rapid Transit District ("**BART**") (an electric rail commuter service linking San Francisco with the East Bay and the San Francisco Peninsula, including SFO), Caltrain (a conventional commuter rail line linking San Francisco with the San Francisco Peninsula), and bus and ferry services between San Francisco and residential areas to the north, east and south of San Francisco. San Francisco Municipal Railway ("**Muni**"), operated by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("**SFMTA**"), provides bus and streetcar service within San Francisco. The Port of San Francisco (the "**Port**"), which administers 7.5 miles of Bay waterfront held in "public trust" by the Port on behalf of the people of California, promotes a balance of maritime-related commerce, fishing, recreational, industrial and commercial activities, and natural resource protection.

Government. San Francisco is a city and county chartered pursuant to Article XI, Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Constitution of the State of California and is the only consolidated city and county in California. Voters approved the City's current Charter at the November 1995 election. The City is governed by a Board of Supervisors elected from 11 districts to serve four-year terms, and a Mayor who serves as chief executive officer, elected citywide to a four-year term. At the November 5, 2024 election, San Francisco voters elected Daniel Lurie as Mayor of the City. The City's original budget for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26 totals approximately $15.9 billion and $15.6 billion,

respectively. The General Fund portion of each year's budget is $6.9 billion in fiscal year 2024-25 and $7.1 billion in fiscal year 2025-26, with the balance allocated to all other funds, including enterprise fund departments, such as the Airport Commission, SFMTA, the Port Commission and the SFPUC. According to the Controller of the City (the "**Controller**"), at the start of fiscal year 2024-25, total net assessed valuation of taxable property in San Francisco was approximately $351.3 billion.

City Financial Challenges. The City continues to face financial challenges resulting from a variety of factors, including continuing remote work by a significant portion of the regional workforce (which has led to declining property taxes for certain office buildings, lower real estate property transfer taxes, and reductions in taxes based on employees physically located in San Francisco), continuing weakness in the local hospitality and convention industries (resulting in declines in hotel and sales taxes), and general economic conditions. These conditions have resulted in projected budget deficits (absent corrective actions) in the hundreds of millions of dollars in future fiscal years, rising to approximately $1.47 billion in fiscal year 2029-30. In December 2024, the Mayor's Office issued budget instructions which, among other things, directs certain ongoing, permanent spending reductions to the General Fund, a re-examination of all contractual services and non-personnel expenditures, the elimination of vacant positions and the consideration of future hiring freezes. On January 9, 2025, Mayor Lurie announced a Citywide hiring freeze through the end of the fiscal year. Certain exemptions are permitted including new hires to support public health, public safety, and other core City priorities.

On April 2, 2025, the Controller's Office issued its most recent report on the status of the San Francisco economy through March 2025. The Controller's Office report noted that continuing good news in San Francisco's downtown recovery is somewhat offset by continuing troubles in the job market. Nearly all of the indicators of downtown economic activity – Muni and BART ridership, office attendance, and employee foot traffic – have trended up in the past several months. The unemployment rate in the San Francisco Metro Division (which includes San Francisco and San Mateo counties) was 3.7% in March 2025, down from 3.9% in January 2025; however, job losses are continuing and the San Francisco Metro Division has lost more than 5% of its total employment, since peaking in mid-2022. Federal employment in the San Francisco Metro Division decreased by 100 jobs from December 2024 to February 2025, a 0.7% loss.

The City's financial challenges described above have not significantly impacted the Water Enterprise's operations or financial condition, although reduced demand for service resulting from some of the factors has required increased rate increases by the Water Enterprise. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Recent Factors Impacting Retail Water Sales."

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

General

The SFPUC is a department of the City responsible for the maintenance, operation and development of three utility enterprises: the Water Enterprise, the Wastewater Enterprise and the Power Enterprise (which is a component of Hetch Hetchy Water and Power). The SFPUC's enterprises are operated and managed as separate financial entities with separate enterprise funds.

- The Water Enterprise provides drinking water to Retail Customers in San Francisco, to certain Retail Customers outside San Francisco and to wholesale customers in three other Bay Area counties.

- The Wastewater Enterprise provides wastewater and stormwater collection, treatment and disposal services for San Francisco (the "**Wastewater Enterprise**").

- Hetch Hetchy Water and Power operates dams (including O'Shaughnessy Dam), reservoirs (including Hetch Hetchy Reservoir), hydroelectric generation and transmission facilities and water transmission facilities from Hetch Hetchy Valley to the connection with the Water Enterprise (collectively, the "**Hetch Hetchy Project**"). In addition, Hetch Hetchy Water and Power provides hydroelectric, solar and other power for municipal and public infrastructure, services and facilities (the "**Power Enterprise**").

CleanPowerSF, managed by the Power Enterprise, is a Community Choice Aggregation program ("**CleanPowerSF**").

The revenues of the Wastewater Enterprise, the Power Enterprise and CleanPowerSF are not available for payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the Bonds. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Pledge of Revenues."

Organization, Purposes and Powers

Water Enterprise. The SFPUC serves as the retail water supplier for San Francisco and is responsible for water deliveries to residents and institutions within San Francisco city limits, as well as to a number of retail accounts outside of San Francisco city limits. In addition, the SFPUC sells water to 27 wholesale customer entities in San Mateo, Alameda and Santa Clara counties under the WSA and/or related individual contractual agreements, as applicable. On average, approximately 70% of the SFPUC's water supply is delivered to the wholesale customers and approximately 30% of the SFPUC's water supply is delivered to Retail Customers. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE."

Wastewater Enterprise. The Wastewater Enterprise's collection and treatment system consists of a combined sewer collection system conveying sewage and stormwater flows within San Francisco to two water pollution control plants and one wet weather treatment facility located within San Francisco. Treated effluent flows are then discharged through mostly deep-water outfalls into the San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean. The Wastewater Enterprise also currently provides sewage treatment service on Treasure Island pursuant to contract, and operates an onsite sewage and stormwater reclamation and treatment facility at the SFPUC headquarters at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California.

The revenues of the Wastewater Enterprise are not "Revenues" under the Indenture and do not secure the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the Bonds. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Pledge of Revenues."

Hetch Hetchy – Water and Power Operations. Hetch Hetchy Water and Power operates the dams (among them O'Shaughnessy Dam being the largest), reservoirs (among them Hetch Hetchy Reservoir being the largest), hydroelectric generation and transmission facilities and water transmission facilities from Hetch Hetchy Valley to the connection with the Water Enterprise, which provides water for distribution through the Water Enterprise and hydroelectric, solar and other power for municipal and public infrastructure, services and facilities of San Francisco. The Power Enterprise was created in 2005 as a separate system within Hetch Hetchy Water and Power. The Power Enterprise provides electric power to meet the municipal requirements of the City, including power to operate municipal streetcars and electric buses, street and traffic lights, municipal buildings and other City facilities, including SFO. Additionally, the Power Enterprise may provide power to the Modesto Irrigation District and Turlock Irrigation District (collectively, the "**Irrigation Districts**"), located in the central valley of California, to certain commercial customers consistent with prescribed contractual obligations and federal law and to certain retail customers in San Francisco. CleanPowerSF, managed by the Power Enterprise, is a Community Choice Aggregation program, pursuant to which the SFPUC pools the electricity demands of CleanPowerSF customers, including certain of San Francisco's residents and businesses, for the purpose of buying electricity on behalf of such customers. CleanPowerSF provides San Francisco with clean energy alternatives at competitive rates.

In September 2019, in connection with the bankruptcy of Pacific Gas & Electric Company ("**PG&E**") and PG&E Corporation, the City submitted a non-binding indication of interest to purchase substantially all of PG&E's electric distribution and transmission assets needed to provide retail electric service to all electricity customers within the geographic boundaries of San Francisco. The City subsequently submitted an additional non-binding indication of interest to PG&E in September 2020. PG&E has not indicated a willingness to sell any such assets. In July 2021, the City submitted a petition to the California Public Utilities Commission ("**CPUC**") for a formal determination of the fair market value of PG&E's assets the City is interested in acquiring. In April 2023, the City filed direct testimony of four expert witnesses with the CPUC regarding the specific assets under consideration for acquisition and the value of such assets. The City remains interested in acquiring these assets from PG&E; however, a transaction has not been consummated, and neither the SFPUC nor the City are able to predict whether a transaction will be consummated or what the terms of any such transaction would be, if consummated.

The revenues of the Power Enterprise and the revenues of CleanPowerSF are not "Revenues" under the Indenture and do not secure the payment of the principal of, premium, if any, or interest on the Bonds. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Pledge of Revenues."

Commission Members

Under the Charter, the SFPUC is given exclusive charge of the operation and management of all water, wastewater and energy supplies and utilities owned or maintained by the City, as well as the real, personal and financial assets under the SFPUC's jurisdiction. The SFPUC is governed by the Commission.

The Commission consists of five members appointed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. Seat 1 is designated for a member with experience in environmental policy and an understanding of environmental justice issues. Seat 2 is designated for a member with experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy. Seat 3 is designated for a member with experience in project finance. Seat 4 is designated for a member with expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management. Seat 5 is designated for an at-large member. Members are appointed for four-year terms and are eligible for reappointment. Members may be suspended by the Mayor and may be removed by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors for official misconduct.

The current members of the Commission and their appointment dates and expiration dates of their current terms are set forth below:

Name and Title	Seat	Appointment Date	Term Expires
Kate H. Stacy, President	4	October 18, 2022	August 1, 2026
Joshua Arce, Vice President	2	October 16, 2024	August 1, 2026
Avni Jamdar	1	October 22, 2024	August 1, 2028
Stephen E. Leveroni	3	October 20, 2024	August 1, 2028
Meghan Thurlow	5	May 23, 2025	August 1, 2028

Management

Management of the SFPUC is led by the General Manager. The General Manager is appointed by the Mayor from candidates submitted by the Commission. Once appointed by the Mayor, the General Manager serves at the pleasure of the Commission; however, the Commission also has Charter authority to employ and does employ the General Manager under an individual contract.

Brief biographies of the General Manager and principal members of the senior management of the SFPUC are set forth below.

Dennis J. Herrera. Dennis J. Herrera commenced serving as the General Manager of the SFPUC on November 1, 2021. Prior to his appointment, Mr. Herrera had been re-elected in November 2019 to a four-year term as City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco. Mr. Herrera was first elected City Attorney in December 2001. Before becoming City Attorney, Mr. Herrera had been a partner in a private law firm and had served in the Clinton Administration as Chief of Staff of the United States Maritime Administration. He also served as president of the San Francisco Police Commission and was a member of the San Francisco Public Transportation Commission. Mr. Herrera earned a B.A. from Villanova University and a J.D. from George Washington School of Law.

Ronald P. Flynn. Ronald P. Flynn is the Deputy General Manager and Chief Operating Officer of the SFPUC. Appointed to this role in 2022, Mr. Flynn works with the General Manager on all policy and strategic initiatives, oversees the SFPUC's daily operations, including business services (finance, accounting, audits, customer services, information technology), external affairs (communications, legislative, community benefits, equity), and human resources. Prior to this position, Mr. Flynn served for almost 16 years in the San Francisco City Attorney's Office under Dennis Herrera. For the last seven years he was the Chief Deputy City Attorney, where he oversaw the City's litigation teams, as well as worked closely with departments and agencies, including the SFPUC, on procurement, financial, and litigation matters. He worked on Hetch Hetchy litigation, PG&E's bankruptcy, and other SFPUC-related

issues. Mr. Flynn previously served as Team Leader of the Construction and Public Contracting Team in the City Attorney's Office, working on many SFPUC projects, including the Water System Improvement Program. Mr. Flynn earned a B.Sc. from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, an Ed.M. from Harvard University, and a J.D. from University of California, Berkeley School of Law.

Nancy L. Hom. Nancy L. Hom is the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant General Manager for Business Services, providing direction and oversight for the Financial Services, Audit, Loans and Grants, Information Technology Services, Customer Services, and Strategy Innovation and Change bureaus. She has led several important bureaus of Business Services, including serving as the Assurance and Internal Control Director for 10 years; and more recently as the SFPUC's Co-Deputy Chief Financial Officer. Ms. Hom has nearly 20 years of experience leading financial and governance teams in public agencies and has extensive knowledge of the City's financial and accounting guidelines and systems, capital improvement projects and regulatory affairs. Prior to joining the SFPUC, she served as the Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Child Support Services and as a leader in the Office of the Controller's Budget and Analysis division. Ms. Hom earned a B.S. in Business Administration from San Francisco State University, concentrating in Finance, Internal Audit, and Project Management. She also maintains two professional certifications from the Institute of Internal Auditors as a Certified Internal Auditor and Certified Risk Management Assurance professional.

Steven R. Ritchie. Steven Ritchie is the Assistant General Manager of the Water Enterprise, responsible for overseeing water system operations and planning from the Hetch Hetchy Project through the Regional Water System to the City Distribution Division. He is also responsible for the management of the SFPUC's lands and natural resources. Mr. Ritchie was the Manager of Planning at the SFPUC from 1995 to 1998. Prior to his current assignment, he managed the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, a multi-agency effort to restore 15,100 acres of valuable habitat in South San Francisco Bay, while providing for flood risk management and public access. In addition, Mr. Ritchie has worked at management positions at the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (1987-1995), the CalFed Bay Delta Program (1998-2000), and URS consultants (2000-2004). He has a B.S. and M.S. in Civil Engineering from Stanford University.

Masood Ordikhani. Masood Ordikhani serves as the Assistant General Manager, External Affairs for the SFPUC. Previously, he served as the SFPUC's first Chief Equity and Innovation Officer, leading the agency's racial equity work. Prior to that role, he was the Director of Workforce and Economic Program Services within the SFPUC's Infrastructure Division. During his tenure in that role, Mr. Ordikhani and his team have developed and delivered several nationally recognized programs. Prior to joining the SFPUC, Mr. Ordikhani was the Deputy Director of the City's Human Rights Commission. In addition, prior to his more than 14 years of public service, he was an attorney in private practice. He is a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley and UC College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly University of California Hastings College of the Law).

Barbara Hale. Barbara Hale is Assistant General Manager of the Power Enterprise. Ms. Hale oversees the Power Enterprise, where she is responsible for all commercial arrangements associated with the purchase and sale of power, whether wholesale or retail, and operations of retail electric service programs. Prior to this role, Ms. Hale served as Analyst, Advisor to the President, Administrative Law Judge, and Division Director at the California Public Utilities Commission. Ms. Hale graduated cum laude from San Francisco State University with a B.A. in Economics, receiving special recognition for high achievement with the Department Honors Award, and pursued extensive graduate coursework in Applied Economics.

Stephen Robinson. Stephen Robinson is the Assistant General Manager for Infrastructure, where he is responsible for capital programs and project implementation for SFPUC facilities, including the Water Capital Improvement Plan, the Wastewater Capital Improvement Plan (which includes the Sewer System Improvement Program), and the Hetchy Capital Improvement Program. Previously, he was the Director of the Wastewater Enterprise Capital Program for SFPUC's Infrastructure Division. He is a Professional Civil Engineer and a UK Chartered Civil Engineer with over two decades of planning, design, construction, and management experience in the water/wastewater sector. Prior to joining SFPUC, Mr. Robinson worked with MWH/Stantec as a consultant and served in the British Army as a Royal Engineer Captain. Mr. Robinson has a master's degree in Civil Engineering and Management from the Queens University of Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Joel Prather. Joel Prather is the Assistant General Manager of the Wastewater Enterprise. His professional background includes more than a decade at the SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, and over 20 years with the City. He started with San Francisco Public Works in the Bureau of Street and Sewer Repair and came to the SFPUC in 2011 as a Maintenance Planner. Prior to his appointment in his current role, he held the position of Maintenance Manager, where he managed the day to day maintenance systems and practices for the wastewater treatment facilities. He earned a B.A. in urban studies from San Francisco State University.

Employee Relations

San Francisco

The City's original budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 included approximately 40,569 full-time and part-time budgeted City positions. City workers are represented by 36 different labor unions. The largest unions in the City include the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers ("**IFPTE**"), Local 21, which represents Water Enterprise employees.

Wages, hours and working conditions of City employees, including employees of the SFPUC, are determined by collective bargaining pursuant to State law (the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, California Government Code Sections 3500-3511) and the City Charter. San Francisco is unusual among California's cities and counties in that nearly all of its employees, including managerial and executive-level employees, are represented by labor organizations.

Further, the City Charter requires binding arbitration to resolve negotiations in the event of an impasse. If an impasse occurs, the parties are required to convene a tripartite arbitration panel, chaired by an impartial third-party arbitrator, which sets the disputed terms of the new agreement. The award of the arbitration panel is final and binding. This process applies to almost all City employees. Since 1976, no City employees have participated in a union-authorized strike, which is prohibited by the City Charter. On July 24, 2023, the California Public Employment Relations Board ("**PERB**") ruled in favor of the Service Employees International Union ("**SEIU**"), Local 1021 and IFPTE, Local 21, concluding that City Charter sections A8.346 and certain portions of section A8.409 prohibiting strikes by City employees are invalid, affirming a proposed decision of an administrative law judge that such City Charter provisions violate the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act. The City has filed a notice of appeal to the California Court of Appeal with respect to the PERB decision. The City can give no assurance whether the appeal will be successful. See "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operation – *Labor Actions*."

The City's employee selection procedures are established and maintained through a civil service system. In general, selection procedures and other merit system issues, with the exception of discipline, are not subject to arbitration. Disciplinary actions are generally subject to grievance arbitration, with the exception of sworn police officers and fire fighters.

In 2024, the City negotiated three-year agreements (for Fiscal Years 2024-25 through 2026-27) with 27 labor unions, including various labor unions that represent Water Enterprise employees. The parties agreed to the following: a 1.5% wage increase effective July 1, 2024; a 1.5% wage increase effective January 4, 2025; a 1% wage increase effective June 30, 2025, at close of business, and a 1% wage increase effective July 1, 2025, for a total compounded increase of 2.01% effective July 1, 2025; a 1.5% wage increase effective January 3, 2026; a 2% wage increase effective June 30, 2026, at close of business; a 2% wage increase effective January 2, 2027; and a 2.5% wage increase effective June 30, 2027, at close of business. These increases have no off ramps (potential deferrals triggered by the budget). The total compounded increase over three years is 13.753%. All City employees shall earn no less than $25 per hour as of July 1, 2024 (which affects SEIU, Local 1021, and Laborers, Local 261).

SFPUC

The SFPUC currently employs approximately 2,400 of the City's workers, of which approximately 43.9% work for the Water Enterprise. The Charter governs the SFPUC's employment policies and authorizes the San Francisco Civil Service Commission to establish rules and procedures to implement those policies. Of the 36 labor unions representing City workers more broadly, 14 presently represent SFPUC employees, as set forth in "Table 1 – SFPUC and Water Enterprise Employees Covered by Memoranda of Understanding."

Over the next five years, approximately 35.8% of the SFPUC workforce agency-wide, including approximately 26% of the Water Enterprise workforce, will be eligible for retirement. A new generation of jobs will require workers with specialized training, skills and experience. The SFPUC's 2020 Strategic Sustainability Plan includes an "effective workforce" goal, which focuses on a number of workforce development and sustainability initiatives. The SFPUC provides career opportunities and training to San Francisco residents and partners with unions, the City and other stakeholders to support apprenticeships and pre-apprentice training programs in the skilled trades to help maintain a skilled and reliable workforce for the SFPUC's operations and infrastructure development. In addition, the SFPUC provides high school, college and graduate student internship programs that span a variety of fields including engineering, water and wastewater management, finance, communications, human resources and information technology. The SFPUC also provides ethics training, diversity training, management training, environmental management system training, as well as fraud prevention and awareness training.

The following table summarizes the number of SFPUC and Water Enterprise employees covered by a memorandum of understanding (similar to a collective bargaining agreement), each of which will expire on June 30, 2027.

TABLE 1
SFPUC AND WATER ENTERPRISE
EMPLOYEES COVERED BY
MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING

Employee Bargaining Unit	SFPUC Full-Time Equivalent Employment[(1)]	Water Enterprise Full-Time Equivalent Employment[(1)]
International Association of Machinists, Lodge 1414	55	37
Carpenters, Local 22	21	13
Hod Carriers, Local 36	2	0
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 6	142	31
Laborers, Local 261	171	93
Municipal Executives Association	229	46
Operating Engineers, Local 3	24	17
Plumbers, Local 38	240	174
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21	1,179	239
Service Employees International Union, Local 1021	368	86
San Francisco City Workers United	14	5
Stationary Engineers, Local 39	294	89
Teamsters, Local 853	36	19
Transport Workers Union Local 250-A, Automotive Service Workers	6	5
Unrepresented Employees[(2)]	1	0
Total	2,782	854

(1) Represents budgeted numbers as of July 1, 2024. Actual full-time equivalent employment totals will differ from the number of positions budgeted by the SFPUC for a variety of reasons, including certain requirements in the respective memoranda of understanding (similar to collective bargaining agreements). See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – General – *City Budget Process*."

(2) Not covered by a memorandum of understanding (similar to a collective bargaining agreement).

Source: SFPUC.

Employee Benefit Plans

Retirement System Plan Description. The San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System (the "**Retirement System**" or "**SFERS**") is charged with administering a defined-benefit pension plan (the "**Plan**") that covers substantially all City employees, including SFPUC employees, and certain other employees. The Retirement System was initially established by approval of San Francisco voters on November 2, 1920, and the State Legislature on January 12, 1921, and is currently codified in the Charter. The Charter provisions governing the Retirement System may be revised only by a Charter amendment, which requires an affirmative public vote at a duly called election. The Retirement System is administered by the Retirement Board (the "**Retirement Board**"). The Plan provides basic service retirement, disability and death benefits based on specified percentages of final average salary and provides cost-of-living adjustments after retirement. The Plan also provides pension continuation benefits to qualified survivors.

Funding Practices. Employer and employee (member) contributions are mandated by the Charter. Sponsoring employers, including the SFPUC, are required to contribute 100% of the actuarially determined contribution approved by the Retirement Board. The Charter specifies that employer contributions consist of the normal cost (the present value of the benefits that SFERS expects to become payable in the future attributable to a current year's employment) plus an amortization of the unfunded liability over a period not to exceed 20 years. The Retirement Board sets the funding policy subject to the Charter requirements.

The Retirement Board adopts the economic and demographic assumptions used in the annual valuations. Demographic assumptions such as retirement, termination and disability rates are based upon periodic demographic studies performed by a consulting actuarial firm approximately every five years. Economic assumptions are reviewed each year by the Retirement Board after receiving an economic experience analysis from the consulting actuarial firm.

The Retirement Board adopted the current demographic assumptions at its December 9, 2020 Retirement Board meeting based on the experience study dated August 12, 2020. The current discount rate of 7.20% was adopted at the November 10, 2021 Retirement Board meeting, effective for the July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation. The Retirement Board most recently voted to maintain these assumptions (for the July 1, 2024 actuarial valuation) at its November 13, 2024 meeting.

While employee contribution rates are mandated by the Charter, sources of payment of employee contributions may be the subject of collective bargaining agreements with each union or bargaining unit. Since July 1, 2011, substantially all employee groups have agreed through collective bargaining for employees to contribute all employee contributions through pre-tax payroll deductions.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

The following table shows total Retirement System liabilities, assets and percent funded for the last five actuarial valuations, as well as total contributions for the last five Fiscal Years ending June 30, 2024.

TABLE 2
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM
FISCAL YEARS 2020-21 THROUGH 2024-25
(IN THOUSANDS)

As of July 1st	Actuarial Liability	Market Value of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Market Percent Funded	Actuarial Percent Funded	Employee and Employer Contribution in Prior Fiscal Year	Employer Contribution Rates in Prior Fiscal Year[(1)]
2020	$29,499,918	$26,620,218	$26,695,844	90.2%	90.5%	$1,143,634	25.19%
2021	31,905,275	35,673,834	30,043,222	111.8	94.2	1,245,957	26.90
2022	33,591,565	32,798,524	32,275,474	97.6	96.1	1,191,934	24.41
2023	35,351,967	33,688,428	34,137,005	95.3	96.6	1,086,567	21.35
2024	37,314,504	35,417,666	36,038,298	94.9	96.6	1,100,130	18.24

(1) Employer contribution rates are shown prior to employer/employee cost-sharing provisions of 2011 Proposition C. Employer contribution rates for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26 are 16.91% and 16.53%, respectively.

Source: SFERS' audited year-end financial statements and required supplemental information. SFERS' annual Actuarial Valuation Report dated July 1st.

Note: Information above reflects entire Retirement System, which covers substantially all City employees, including SFPUC employees, and certain other employees.

The City's net pension assets for its proportionate share of the net pension asset of the Plan and net pension liability of the Replacement Benefits Plan, a qualified excess benefit plan that covers some Water Enterprise employees were approximately $3.6 billion for Fiscal Year 2023-24. The amount allocable to the Water Enterprise, as of June 30, 2024, was approximately $150.1 million.

The SFPUC is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate and allocates the applicable portions of such contribution to the separate enterprises, including the Water Enterprise. For Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24, the SFPUC's employee contribution rates varied from 7.5% to 12.0% as a percentage of gross covered salary. For Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24, the Water Enterprise has paid 100% of its required contributions. The contributions by the Water Enterprise required for Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24 are summarized in the following table:

TABLE 3
WATER ENTERPRISE RETIREMENT SYSTEM CONTRIBUTION
FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 THROUGH 2023-24
(IN THOUSANDS)

Fiscal Year (Measurement Period)	Employer Contribution Rates	Water Enterprise Contribution
2019-20	25.2%	$29,647
2020-21	26.9	33,367
2021-22	24.4	31,151
2022-23	21.3	27,925
2023-24	18.2	26,653

Sources: Compiled from SFERS Actuarial Valuation report as of July 1, 2023, and SFPUC's audited financial statements for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2022-23, and for Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2021-22.

Plan Financial Reports and Funded Status. The Retirement System issues a publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information for the Plan. That report may be obtained on their website at https://mysfers.org/about-sfers/publications/. *The website is provided for convenience only and the report is not incorporated by reference into this Official Statement and should not be relied upon in making an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds.*

Health Care Benefits. The SFPUC participates in the City's agent multiple employer defined benefit plan, which operates as a cost-sharing multiple employer defined benefit plan (the "**OPEB Plan**"). The OPEB Plan is maintained by the City and is administered through the City's Health Service System and provides postemployment medical, dental and vision insurance benefits to eligible employees, retired employees, and surviving spouses. Health benefit provisions are established and may be amended through negotiations between the City and the respective bargaining units. The City does not issue a separate report on its other post-employment benefit plan.

As prescribed under Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("**GASB**") Statement No. 75, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefits Other than Pensions*, net OPEB liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to OPEB, and OPEB expense are actuarially determined on a citywide basis. Net OPEB liability is measured as the portion of the present value of projected benefit payments to be provided to current active and inactive employees attributed to those employees' past service, less the amount of the Retiree Healthcare Trust Fund investments measured at fair value.

The following table shows the City's reported net OPEB liabilities and the Water Enterprise's proportionate share of such net OPEB liabilities for Fiscal Years 2021-22 through 2023-24:

TABLE 4
ANNUAL OPEB OBLIGATION
FOR FISCAL YEARS 2021-22 TO 2023-24
(IN THOUSANDS)

Fiscal Year	City's Reported Net OPEB Liabilities	Water Enterprise's Proportionate Share of City's Net OPEB liabilities	City's Contribution Amount	Water Enterprise's Proportionate Share of City's Contribution Amount
2021-22	$3,691,122	$144,115	$252,866	$ 9,873
2022-23	3,746,270	148,601	260,649	10,339
2023-24	3,924,832	158,301	278,701	11,241

Source: SFPUC.

The City issues a publicly available financial report on a City-wide level that includes the complete note disclosures and required supplementary information related to the City's post-retirement health care obligations. The report may be obtained on the Controller's website at https://www.sf.gov/departments/controllers-office. *The website is provided for convenience only and the report is not incorporated by reference into this Official Statement and should not be relied upon in making an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds.*

Voter Approved Changes to the Retirement Plan. SFERS plan benefits are established under the Charter and approved directly by the voters, rather than through the collective bargaining process. Changes to retirement benefits require a voter-approved Charter amendment. In 2011, voters approved Proposition C which aimed to reduce future pension costs. Proposition C introduced new lower-cost benefit tiers for all members hired on and after January 7, 2012 and also restricted the payment of any new supplemental COLAs to when SFERS is fully funded. Since 2011, the fully funded requirement for Supplemental COLAs has been removed from all members hired before January 7, 2012. First, the October 2015 Superior Court judgement removed the fully funded requirement for pre-Proposition C members retired on and after November 6, 1996. Then in November 2022, voters approved Proposition A which removed the fully funded requirement for retirees who commenced benefits prior to November 6, 1996. However, for this older group of retirees only, the amount of supplemental COLA is capped at $200 per month for retirees with annual pensions exceeding $50,000 when SFERS is not fully funded. The Proposition C fully funded

restriction remains in effect for retirees hired on and after January 7, 2012. In addition, for these post-2011 hires, the supplemental COLA is temporary and reverts to zero in any year in which no supplemental COLA is paid.

THE WATER ENTERPRISE

General

The SFPUC operates the facilities of its Water Enterprise to optimize the reliability and quality of its water deliveries. The SFPUC has made and will continue to make significant capital investments in the facilities of the Water Enterprise, designed to maximize the Water Enterprise's ability to deliver water sufficient to meet the needs of its customers following the occurrence of a major seismic event or during an extended period of drought.

The SFPUC serves as the retail water supplier for San Francisco and is responsible for water deliveries to residents and institutions within San Francisco city limits, as well as to several retail accounts outside of San Francisco city limits. In addition, the SFPUC sells water to 26 Wholesale Customers in San Mateo, Alameda and Santa Clara counties under the WSA and related individual contractual agreements. The Wholesale Customers are members of BAWSCA, which is a public agency separate and apart from the Wholesale Customers. The SFPUC also sells water to wholesale customer Cordilleras Mutual Water Company in San Mateo County, which is not a party to the WSA or a member of BAWSCA. Altogether, approximately 2.7 million people rely on water supplied by the Water Enterprise.

The Water Enterprise consists of over 389 miles of pipeline, over 74 miles of tunnels, 11 reservoirs, 13 groundwater wells, five pump stations, and three water treatment plants located outside of San Francisco, and over 1,235 miles of pipeline, 11 reservoirs, six groundwater wells, 11 storage tanks, 25 pump stations, eight hydropneumatic stations and 18 chlorination stations located within the San Francisco city limits.

The Regional Water System draws approximately 85% of its water from the Upper Tuolumne River watershed feeding a single aqueduct system, delivering water 120 miles by gravity to Bay Area reservoirs and users. The remaining water supply is drawn from local surface waters in the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds.

Water Rights and Related Proceedings

Prior to the Gold Rush in 1849, local water supplies were largely adequate to meet the needs of what is now San Francisco. The Spring Valley Water Company, purchased by the City in 1930, developed much of the local water supplies now available to the Water Enterprise. San Francisco's population grew rapidly after the Gold Rush to nearly 400,000 by the time of the Great Earthquake of 1906.

As early as the 1880s, the City began looking to the Sierra Nevada and the Tuolumne River in what is now Yosemite National Park as a possible source of abundant, clean water for San Francisco and the Bay Area. Hetch Hetchy Valley, which is located on the Tuolumne River in Yosemite National Park, was first recommended in 1891 as a reservoir site in a United States Geological Survey Study. Then-Mayor James D. Phelan made the first filings for water rights and reservoir rights-of-way in the Tuolumne River watershed as a private citizen and transferred those filings to the City in 1903.

Following the Great Earthquake of 1906, the City again sought water rights and reservoir rights-of-way in the Tuolumne River watershed and began to develop a preliminary design for the Hetch Hetchy System (as defined herein). The City also entered into negotiations with the Irrigation Districts to protect their existing water rights and to provide them with a share of the hydroelectric power to be produced by Hetch Hetchy facilities, at cost-based rates.

The federal Raker Act enacted on December 19, 1913 (the "**Raker Act**"), grants to the City rights-of-way and public land use on United States government property in the Sierra Nevada to construct, operate and maintain reservoirs, dams, conduits and other structures necessary or incidental to developing and using water and power. It also imposes restrictions on the City's use of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, including, among others, the requirement that the City recognize the prior rights of the Irrigation Districts to receive water, up to specified amounts of natural daily flow, for direct use and storage. After 20 years of construction of dams and aqueducts, the City first delivered water from the Hetch Hetchy System to the Bay Area on October 24, 1934.

The City voluntarily releases water into the Tuolumne River and tributaries from its facilities under stipulations with the United States Department of the Interior, which controls a portion of the public lands that contain Raker Act rights of way. The SFPUC diverts water under its water rights acquired under State water law, which entitles the SFPUC to appropriate more than 400 million gallons per day ("**mgd**") from the Tuolumne River and its tributaries.

The City holds "pre-1914" appropriative water rights for the City's beneficial use, including the storage and diversion of water for the Hetch Hetchy and local water systems. The City also holds a post-1914 appropriative water right license from the SWRCB for the San Antonio Reservoir. Pre-1914 water rights are not subject to the water right permitting authority of the SWRCB but remain subject to jurisdiction concerning adequacy of the right and reasonableness of water use.

See "– Current Water Supply Sources" and "– RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations – *Proposals to Restore Hetch Hetchy Valley*."

Current Water Supply Sources

Regional Water System. The Regional Water System is a complex system which supplies water from two primary sources: the Tuolumne River through Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and local runoff into Bay Area reservoirs in the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds. Water developed via Hetch Hetchy Reservoir through Hetch Hetchy facilities represents the majority of the water supply available to the SFPUC. Local watershed facilities are operated to capture local runoff for delivery. Local area water production is dependent on precipitation and the ability of the SFPUC to regulate watershed runoff. On average, Hetch Hetchy Reservoir provides approximately 85% of the water delivered, and Bay Area reservoirs provide approximately 15% of the water delivered.

Local Groundwater. San Francisco overlies all or part of seven groundwater basins: the Westside, Lobos, Marina, Downtown, Islais Valley, South and Visitacion Valley basins. The Lobos, Marina, Downtown and South basins are located wholly within San Francisco city limits, while the remaining three extend south into San Mateo County. The portion of the Westside Basin aquifer located within San Francisco is commonly referred to as the North Westside Basin. Except for the Westside and Lobos basins, all of the basins are generally inadequate to supply a significant amount of groundwater for municipal supply due to low yield.

Early in its history, the City made significant use of local groundwater, springs, and spring fed surface water. However, after the development of surface water supplies in the Peninsula and Alameda watersheds by Spring Valley Water Company and the subsequent completion of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and aqueduct in the 1930s, the municipal water supply system has relied almost exclusively on surface water from the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds, and the Tuolumne River watershed. Local groundwater use, however, has continued in San Francisco primarily for irrigation purposes. The San Francisco Zoo and Golden Gate Park use approximately 1.2 mgd of groundwater for non-potable purposes. In April 2017, the SFPUC began pumping groundwater from the North Westside Basin aquifer. The groundwater is treated and blended with the SFPUC's regional drinking water supplies before it is delivered to the SFPUC's customers. Currently, groundwater represents approximately 0.4 mgd in the drinking water supply.

Approximately 0.4 mgd of groundwater is delivered to Castlewood Country Club from well fields operated by the SFPUC in Pleasanton and drawn from the Central Groundwater Sub Basin in the Livermore/Amador Valley. These wells are metered and have been in operation for several decades. There is no physical connection between the Castlewood Country Club wells and the Regional Water System. For purposes of water accounting and billing, these deliveries to Castlewood Country Club are accounted for as part of the SFPUC's Retail Customer base.

Local Recycled Water. Current use of recycled water for non-potable purposes in San Francisco is less than one mgd, which is reflective of the limited non-potable demands in San Francisco's dense urban environment. The Sharp Park Recycled Water Project and the Harding Park Recycled Water Project collectively used 0.03 mgd of recycled water for irrigating City-owned golf courses in Fiscal Year 2023-24.

Local Water Conservation. The SFPUC is committed to demand-side management programs; San Francisco's per capita water use has dropped by almost 50 percent since 1977 in part due to these programs. The first substantial decrease came following the 1976-77 drought in which gross per capita water use dropped from 160

to 130 gallons per capita per day ("**gpcd**"). Despite nearly continuous growth in San Francisco since then, water demand levels have remained lower than water demand levels prior to the 1976-77 drought due to building code requirements and improved technology.

A second substantial decrease in water use within San Francisco occurred because of the 1987-92 drought, when a new level of conservation activities resulted in further water use savings, and per capita use dropped sharply again in the 2012-2015 drought. While per capita water use increased very slightly after the 2012-2015 drought and before the 2020-2022 drought, it has remained well below 2013 levels. Gross per capita water use within San Francisco was 68.0 gpcd in Fiscal Year 2023-24, with residential per capita water use calculated to be 41.8 gpcd, one of the lowest per capita rates of any urban area in the State, and approximately one-half of the statewide average. It is anticipated that through the continuation and expansion of these programs, per capita water use will remain low.

The SFPUC's water conservation program offers financial incentives, services and educational assistance, all aimed at promoting efficient water use. The conservation program implemented by the SFPUC is based on, among other things, State and local indoor and outdoor efficiency requirements, the Water System Improvement Program ("**WSIP**"), and analysis of local efficient plumbing fixture saturation rates and water-saving opportunities in the SFPUC retail service area.

Limitations on Use of Potable Water. The City also restricts the use of potable water for soil compaction and dust control (activities associated with construction) when recycled water is available. In addition, the City requires new developments of 100,000 gross square-feet or more to install and operate onsite water reuse projects. This program currently results in a potable water offset of 0.12 mgd.

Water Supply Storage

The amount of water available to the SFPUC's Retail Customers and wholesale customers is constrained by hydrology, physical facilities, and the institutional parameters that allocate the water supply of the Tuolumne River. While in most years the SFPUC receives adequate water supply to meet its demands, during dry years, the SFPUC has only a small share of Tuolumne River runoff available and the local Bay Area watersheds produce limited volume of water. Due to these constraints, the SFPUC is dependent on reservoir storage to firm up its water supplies. More importantly, reservoir storage provides the Regional Water System with year-to-year water supply carry-over capability. Reservoir storage is critical to the SFPUC during drought cycles since it enables the SFPUC to carry-over water supply from wet years to dry years. See "WATER FACILITIES – Water Storage."

Water Supply Reliability and Drought Planning

The SFPUC water supply system's reliability is expressed in terms of its ability to deliver water during droughts. Reliability is defined by the amount and frequency of water delivery reductions required to balance customer demands with available supplies in droughts. The total amount of water the SFPUC has available to deliver to its Retail Customers and its wholesale customers during a defined period depends on several factors, including the amount of water that is available to the SFPUC from natural runoff; the amount of water in reservoir storage; groundwater supply; and the amount of water that must be released from the SFPUC's system for commitments for purposes other than customer deliveries (such as releases below Hetch Hetchy Reservoir to meet Raker Act and fishery purposes).

The SFPUC operates its system to optimize the reliability and quality of its water deliveries. Two principal objectives guide Hetch Hetchy Reservoir operations: collection of Tuolumne River water runoff for diversion to the Bay Area; and fulfillment of the SFPUC's downstream release obligations. To ensure water supply, Hetch Hetchy Project reservoirs remain high through the early winter, until sufficient snowmelt runoff is forecasted at 90% certainty to fill all Tuolumne reservoirs. When the forecasted snowmelt is certain to be in excess of the fill volume, the reservoirs may be drawn down through power operations to increase revenue without risking water supply.

Similarly, the SFPUC operates the Regional Water System's Bay Area reservoirs to conserve watershed runoff, drawing down reservoirs early in the winter period to capture storms and reduce the potential for spilling water out of the reservoirs. In the spring, Hetch Hetchy water (snowmelt) is often transferred to three of the Bay Area reservoirs that are capable of receiving the water so that any unused local reservoir storage is filled prior to July 1.

Prior to 1976, droughts had not seriously affected the SFPUC's ability to sustain full deliveries to its customers. During a subsequent drought in 1987-92, as reservoir storage continued to decline, it became apparent that continued full deliveries could not be sustained without the risk of running out of water before the drought ended. As a result of these experiences, to provide some level of assurance that water could be delivered continuously throughout a drought (although at reduced levels), the SFPUC adopted a drought planning sequence, incorporating an 8.5-year drought scenario for planning purposes (based on the combined number of actual drought years from 1976-1977 and 1987-92), and associated operating procedures that trigger different levels of water delivery reduction rationing relative to the volume of water actually stored in SFPUC reservoirs. Each year, during the snowmelt period, the SFPUC evaluates the amount of total water storage expected to occur throughout the Regional Water System. If this evaluation finds the projected total water storage to be less than an identified level sufficient to provide sustained deliveries during the drought scenario, the SFPUC may impose mandatory delivery reductions or rationing.

Rationing. With current contractual obligations to deliver up to 184 mgd to the SFPUC's Wholesale Customers and 81 mgd to its Retail Customers combined with current water supplies and reservoir storages, the Regional Water System can be expected to experience up to a 25% shortage from 15% to 20% of the time, over multiple-year drought sequences. During a drought, Retail and Wholesale Customers could experience a reduction in the amount of water received from the Regional Water System. The amount of the reduction would be dictated by existing contractual agreements between the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers, as detailed in the existing Water Shortage Allocation Plan that is an attachment to the WSA (the "**Water Shortage Allocation Plan**"). The Water Shortage Allocation Plan allocates available water between the Retail Customers and the Wholesale Customers collectively, with specific allocations for each established for different levels of systemwide shortage. Under the Water Shortage Allocation Plan, specific rationing amounts applied to Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers will be determined by their subsequent shortage plans as required to remain with their share of the systemwide allocation.

The Water Shortage Allocation Plan applies to systemwide shortages of up to 20%. For shortages in excess of this amount, the WSA provides that the SFPUC may allocate water at its discretion, subject to legal challenge by Wholesale Customers, if agreement cannot be reached regarding treatment of shortages in excess of 20%. The WSA also includes provisions for drought and emergency pricing. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS."

System Delivery Capability. System delivery capability is defined as the water delivery the Regional Water System is able to sustain over historical hydrologic conditions including multiple-year drought sequences. Under existing SFPUC operations policies and procedures, the SFPUC has a system delivery capability of 257 mgd. That is, the Regional Water System is capable of sustaining a 257 mgd annual average delivery over a hydrologic period equivalent to that experienced from 1921 to 2002 with shortages due to drought. This delivery capability is based on the SFPUC's substantial completion of the WSIP program. During non-drought years, the Regional Water System is capable of sustainably delivering 265 mgd.

Water Supply Initiatives. In 2019, with the goal of ensuring that the water needs of Retail and Wholesale Customers will continue to be met under future conditions in the event of dry-year shortages, the SFPUC established an alternative water supply program (the "**AWS Program**") to evaluate new and diverse alternative water supply options, such as expanding storage, groundwater banking, transfers, purified water (potable reuse), desalination and technological innovations. For more information regarding the AWS Program, see "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Water Supply Initiatives."

Wholesale Deliveries

Wholesale Service Area and Customer Base. The Water Enterprise provides wholesale water service to 27 wholesale customers, which consist of 25 public agencies, one private utility, and one private, not-for-profit educational institution. All of the wholesale customers are located within Alameda County, Santa Clara County or San Mateo County.

- Alameda County is located to the east of San Francisco Bay and extends from the cities of Berkeley and Albany in the north to the City of Fremont in the south. Alameda County contains 14 incorporated cities. The California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit estimated Alameda County's

population at 1,641,869 as of January 1, 2024. Most of its population is concentrated in a highly urbanized area between the San Francisco Bay and the East Bay Hills.

- Santa Clara County lies immediately south of San Mateo County and encompasses an area of approximately 1,316 square miles. Santa Clara County contains 15 incorporated cities, including San José, the third largest city in the State. The California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit estimated Santa Clara County's population at 1,903,198 as of January 1, 2024. Most of its population is concentrated in the extensively urbanized and heavily industrialized northern portion of Santa Clara County.

- San Mateo County is located on the San Francisco Peninsula, immediately south of San Francisco and west of the San Francisco Bay. San Mateo County covers 446 square miles and contains 20 incorporated cities. Coastal mountains run north and south, dividing the lightly populated western part of the county from the heavily populated eastern corridor between San Francisco and Santa Clara/Silicon Valley. The California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit estimated San Mateo County's population at 741,565 as of January 1, 2024.

- Alameda County, Santa Clara County and San Mateo County all have diversified economies and median household incomes higher than State and national averages.

Collectively, the wholesale customers provide retail water service to over 1.8 million people and 40,000 commercial, industrial and institutional accounts in their respective service areas, with the balance of the respective population being serviced by other providers. All wholesale customers are billed monthly on the basis of metered water use and in accordance with the WSA and their individual water sales contracts.

The following is a list of the 27 wholesale customers:

Wholesale Customers

Municipalities	Water Purveying Districts	Private Entities
City of Brisbane[1]	Alameda County Water District	California Water Service Company[2]
City of Burlingame	Coastside County Water District	Stanford University
City of Daly City	Cordilleras Mutual Water Company[4]	
City of East Palo Alto	Estero Municipal Improvement District	
City of Hayward	Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District[1]	
City of Menlo Park	Mid-Peninsula Water District	
City of Millbrae	North Coast County Water District	
City of Milpitas	Purissima Hills Water District	
City of Mountain View	Westborough County Water District	
City of Palo Alto		
City of Redwood City		
City of San Bruno		
City of San José[3]		
City of Santa Clara[3]		
City of Sunnyvale		
Town of Hillsborough		

(1) Brisbane and Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District are jointly operated.

(2) California Water Service Company, an investor-owned utility, provides water service to three separate districts: Bear Gulch (Atherton/Woodside vicinity and including the former Skyline County Water District), Mid-Peninsula (San Carlos/San Mateo vicinity), and South San Francisco. Over the past five Fiscal Years, California Water Service Company has purchased, on average, approximately 14.4% of the total water delivered annually by the SFPUC. Such purchases accounted, on average, for approximately 12.7% of the SFPUC's total annual revenues.

(3) The SFPUC provides water on an interruptible basis to fixed service areas in the northern portions of the cities of San José and Santa Clara. See "– *Status of San José and Santa Clara*" below.

(4) Cordilleras Mutual Water Company is the only wholesale customer that is not a member of BAWSCA and not a party to the WSA.

The following table shows the percentage of water purchased from the Regional Water System by each of the Wholesale Customers in Fiscal Year 2023-24, the most recent fiscal year for which data is available. Sixteen of the Wholesale Customers derived over 90% of their water from the SFPUC.

TABLE 5
PERCENTAGE OF WATER PURCHASED FROM THE REGIONAL WATER SYSTEM BY WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS IN FISCAL YEAR 2023-24[(1)]

		Water Purchased (mgd)		
	Population	**SFPUC**	**Total**	**% SFPUC**
Alameda County Water District	344,000	10.23	34.34	29.79%
California Water Service Company	262,924	27.31	27.46	99.45
City of Hayward	162,954	13.18	13.34	98.80
City of Sunnyvale	157,566	9.40	16.65	56.46
City of Santa Clara	130,746	2.74	18.75	14.61
City of Daly City	98,000	3.13	5.24	59.73
City of Redwood City	91,874	7.71	8.23	93.68
City of Mountain View	81,501	7.36	8.76	84.02
City of Milpitas	81,773	5.32	8.30	64.10
City of Palo Alto	67,901	9.07	10.02	90.52
City of San Bruno	44,745	2.62	2.77	94.58
North Coast County Water District	36,426	2.16	2.20	98.18
City of San José	45,559	3.89	4.67	83.30
Estero Municipal Improvement District	35,556	3.98	3.98	100.00
City of Burlingame	31,457	3.16	3.16	100.00
Mid-Peninsula Water District	30,609	2.27	2.27	100.00
City of East Palo Alto	27,638	1.53	1.53	100.00
City of Millbrae	22,087	1.73	1.73	100.00
City of Menlo Park	21,340	2.56	2.56	100.00
Coastside County Water District	18,940	0.87	1.42	61.27
Stanford University	37,329	1.49	2.54	58.66
Westborough Water District	13,486	0.68	0.68	100.00
Town of Hillsborough	11,766	2.17	2.17	100.00
Purissima Hills Water District	6,245	1.39	1.39	100.00
City of Brisbane / Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District	4,862	0.61	0.61	100.00
Total All Agencies	**1,867,284**	**126.56**	**184.77**	**68.50%**

(1) Does not include wholesale customer Cordilleras Mutual Water Company, which is not a BAWSCA member agency and not a party to the WSA.

Source: SFPUC; compiled from BAWSCA Annual Survey Fiscal Year 2023-24, dated April 2025.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

The following table summarizes the sources of supply for the Wholesale Customers collectively during Fiscal Year 2023-24 (most recent data available).

TABLE 6
WATER DELIVERIES TO WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS BY SOURCE[1]
FISCAL YEAR 2023-24

Source	Acre-Feet	Percent of Total
SFPUC[2]	143,442	69.3%
Groundwater	20,657	8.2
Surface Water	7,802	3.8
Recycled Water	8,072	3.9
Other Sources (Includes State/Federal)	30,684	14.8
Total	206,936	100.0%

(1) Does not include wholesale customer Cordilleras Mutual Water Company, which is not a BAWSCA member agency and not a party to the WSA.
(2) Purchases from the Regional Water System. Includes supplemental deliveries.
Source: SFPUC; compiled from BAWSCA Annual Survey Fiscal Year 2023-24, dated April 2025.

The Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency. BAWSCA is the successor agency to the Bay Area Water Users Association ("**BAWUA**"). BAWUA was originally formed as a non-profit mutual benefit corporation to represent the Wholesale Customers' collective interests in their interactions with the SFPUC. Concerned that their needs and interests were not properly represented by the SFPUC, BAWUA lobbied for the creation of an entity with authority to plan for and acquire supplemental water supplies, encourage water conservation and use of recycled water on a regional basis, and assist in the financing of essential repairs and improvements to the Regional Water System. State legislation AB 2058, passed in 2002, allowed the formal creation of BAWSCA.

BAWSCA is governed by a 26-member Board of Directors that is composed of community leaders representing its 26 members. BAWSCA has the authority to coordinate water conservation, supply and recycling activities for its agencies; acquire water and make it available to other agencies on a wholesale basis; finance projects, including improvements to the Regional Water System; and build facilities jointly with other local public agencies or on its own to carry out its purposes. BAWSCA has not, to date, acquired water or built facilities.

Regional Water System Financing Authority. The Wholesale Customers, together with the SFPUC, formed the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System Financing Authority ("**RFA**") in 2002. While BAWSCA focuses on planning and water management and may engage in public works projects, the RFA exists solely to help fund capital improvements to the Regional Water System. The RFA has the power to issue revenue bonds to fund projects to improve the reliability of the Regional Water System; provide proceeds of revenue bonds to the City under specified conditions to improve reliability of the system; and apply for and receive State and federal grants, loans and other financial assistance.

Debt service on any bonds issued by the RFA in the future would be secured by, and paid from, a surcharge imposed by the SFPUC upon Wholesale Customers and, under specific conditions, upon Retail Customers. This surcharge would be imposed in an amount sufficient to pay debt service on the RFA's bonds and its operating expenses. Proceeds of the surcharge would not constitute Revenues under the Indenture, and debt service on these bonds, if issued, would not be a debt or liability of the SFPUC or the City.

The RFA has not, to date, issued any revenue bonds, and the SFPUC is not now aware of any current plans by the RFA to do so. The ability of the RFA to issue bonds expires in December 2030.

Prior Master Water Sales Contract. Between 1984 and 2009, Wholesale Customer rates were set pursuant to a Settlement Agreement and Master Water Sales Contract (the "**Prior Master Water Sales Contract**"). The Prior Master Water Sales Contract put in place a comprehensive method for allocating the costs of the Regional Water System between the SFPUC's Retail Customers and the Wholesale Customers. Capital costs and most operations and maintenance expenses of the Regional Water System were distributed between the SFPUC and its Retail Customers

and the Wholesale Customers on proportional water usage: approximately one-third to the City and two-thirds to the Wholesale Customers.

The Prior Master Water Sales Contract resolved litigation over certain rate-setting practices. Both sides dismissed, with prejudice, the claims related to water sales overcharges and undercharges with the signing of the Prior Master Water Sales Contract. However, the litigation left open certain questions, such as whether the Wholesale Customers are "Co-Grantees" under the Raker Act and, if so, what rights, benefits and privileges accrue to them by reason of such status, including the right to receive water at cost, and the extent to which the City may be legally obligated to provide water to meet growth demands in Wholesale Customer service areas in excess of the 184 mgd "Supply Assurance" discussed below.

Water Supply Agreement. In 2009, the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers entered into the WSA, with an effective date of July 1, 2009, which replaced the Prior Master Water Sales Contract. The WSA has a 25-year term (through June 30, 2034), with provisions for two conditional five-year extensions. It was most recently amended and restated in 2021 with the approval of the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers. The Commission approved an amendment to the WSA on May 13, 2025, for the purpose of adjusting the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities for four Wholesale Customers. The SFPUC anticipates that all of the Wholesale Customers will approve such amendment within the next six months. See "– *Minimum Annual Purchases*."

The WSA separates Water Enterprise assets and expenses into three categories: "wholesale only," "regional," and "retail only." Annual operations and maintenance expenses are recovered based on proportional annual use of the Regional Water System in most cases. Costs and revenues of the Hetch Hetchy Project are also separated – the Wholesale Customers do not pay for power-related costs, which are borne by the Power Enterprise, and do not share in power revenues.

The WSA includes the SFPUC's "Supply Assurance" of 184 mgd (measured on an annual average basis) to 24 of the 26 Wholesale Customers (the "**Supply Assurance**"). The SFPUC has agreed to deliver water to such Wholesale Customers up to the amount of the Supply Assurance, and this agreement is perpetual and survives the expiration of the WSA. The Supply Assurance is, however, subject to reduction due to water shortage, drought, scheduled WSA maintenance activities, and emergencies.

The Supply Assurance is shared among 24 of the Wholesale Customers, 23 of whom have an "Individual Supply Guarantee" (each an "**Individual Supply Guarantee**"), which represents their dedicated individual share of the 184 mgd Supply Assurance. The two Wholesale Customers that do not share in the Supply Assurance, the City of San José ("**San José**") and the City of Santa Clara ("**Santa Clara**"), are served wholesale water on an interruptible basis and are not part of the Supply Assurance. The City of Hayward ("**Hayward**") does not have an Individual Supply Guarantee but rather an individual contract that does not limit its water use. Hayward continues to receive water under a contract entered into in 1962 with no expiration or supply limitation. If Hayward's demand exceeds 22.1 mgd for three consecutive fiscal years, the 23 Wholesale Customers with Individual Supply Guarantees totaling 161.9 mgd would be required to reduce their allocation to meet the needs of Hayward in accordance with the WSA. For Fiscal Year 2023-24, total water purchases by the 23 Wholesale Customers with Individual Supply Guarantees (including Hayward's use but excluding San José and Santa Clara) were approximately 63.02% of the combined Supply Assurance.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

The following table shows the Individual Supply Guarantees and actual Fiscal Year 2023-24 purchases for the Wholesale Customers and also includes Cordilleras Mutual Water Company, which is not a "Wholesale Customer" party to the WSA.

TABLE 7
WHOLESALE CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS
(IN MGD)

	Individual Supply Guarantee[1]	Actual 2023-24 Purchases
Alameda County Water District	13.76	9.94
City of Brisbane / Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District[2]	0.46	0.61
City of Burlingame	5.23	3.16
California Water Service Company[3]	35.50	25.87
Coastside County Water District	2.18	0.82
City of Daly City	4.29	2.73
City of East Palo Alto	3.46	1.59
Estero Municipal Improvement District	5.90	3.72
City of Hayward	22.80	13.14
Town of Hillsborough	4.09	2.16
City of Menlo Park	4.46	2.55
Mid-Peninsula Water District	3.89	2.27
City of Millbrae	3.15	1.74
City of Milpitas	9.23	5.29
City of Mountain View	12.46	7.36
North Coast County Water District	3.84	2.42
City of Palo Alto	16.57	8.92
Purissima Hills Water District	1.62	1.39
City of Redwood City	10.93	7.66
City of San Bruno	3.25	0.92
City of San José[4]	0.00	3.90
City of Santa Clara[4]	0.00	2.73
Stanford University	3.03	1.53
City of Sunnyvale	12.58	9.50
Westborough County Water District	1.32	0.68
Subtotal BAWSCA Demand	**184.00**	**122.60**
Cordilleras Mutual Water Company[5]	--	0.01
Total Wholesale Demand[6]	**--**	**122.61**

(1) "Individual Supply Guarantee" refers to each Wholesale Customer's share of the Supply Assurance as defined in the WSA. The Supply Assurance is the 184 mgd maximum annual average metered supply of water dedicated by SFPUC to public use in the wholesale service area (excluding the cities of San José and Santa Clara). Hayward has no fixed allocation of the Supply Assurance but its share is calculated as 22.1 mgd (184 mgd less the 161.9 mgd total of permanent customer Individual Supply Guarantees).

(2) Brisbane and Guadalupe Valley Municipal Improvement District are two Wholesale Customers that are jointly operated.

(3) Includes Individual Supply Guarantee of Skyline County Water District, which was purchased by California Water Service Company-Bear Gulch District in 2009.

(4) San José and Santa Clara do not have an Individual Supply Guarantee or a share in the Supply Assurance due to their temporary, interruptible status under the WSA.

(5) Cordilleras Mutual Water Company is not a party to the WSA, does not have an Individual Supply Guarantee and does not share in the Supply Assurance.

(6) Totals may not add due to rounding.

Sources: SFPUC; Water Supply Agreement.

The basic framework of the Prior Master Water Sales Contract regarding coordination of wholesale rates with the annual SFPUC budget process, annual compliance audits, resolution of disputes concerning the SFPUC's determination of the annual Wholesale Revenue Requirement (as defined herein) via binding arbitration and the annual true up of costs using a Balancing Account (as defined herein) continue, but the WSA effected significant changes in the arrangement between the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers. The WSA included the following significant changes:

Allocation of Capital Costs. Instead of continuing with the "utility method," the WSA more timely recovers capital costs as follows:

- The costs of existing assets placed in service prior to June 30, 2009, approximately $367 million in 2009 dollars, were to be repaid based on audited actual costs in monthly installments by Wholesale Customers at an annual interest rate of 5.13% over a 25-year period, in lieu of depreciation and a weighted return on these assets. In February 2013, the Wholesale Customers, through BAWSCA, made an early repayment of the entire cost recovery payment balance.

- The costs of new regional assets placed in service after June 30, 2009 are to be paid for using the "cash method." Annual wholesale rates are set to recover the Wholesale Customers' share of regional asset costs from current revenues for cash-funded assets. Wholesale contributions for debt-financed assets include appropriate contributions towards debt service and coverage based on the Wholesale Customers' proportionate annual use of the Regional Water System.

- For the portion of capital project costs that were appropriated but not expended as of June 30, 2009, a 10-year repayment schedule including 4.00% interest has been calculated, based on audited actual costs. Repayment began in Fiscal Year 2014-15 and was scheduled to end in Fiscal Year 2023-24. In September 2020, the Wholesale Customers prepaid the remaining $4,030,664 balance.

For more information regarding the wholesale rate setting mechanism, see "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue," and "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT – Wholesale Revenue Requirement," "– Capital Cost Contribution – New Regional Assets" and "– Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Expenses."

Treatment of Water Supply Issues. The 184 mgd Supply Assurance from the Prior Master Water Sales Contract continues in the WSA. The WSA sets forth how the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers will implement the "**Interim Supply Limitation**" imposed by the SFPUC in its approval of the WSIP in 2008, which limits to 265 mgd the amount of water annually delivered to the Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers from Regional Water System watersheds. Under the Interim Supply Limitation, Retail Customers receive up to 81 mgd and the Wholesale Customers receive up to 184 mgd from the Regional Water System.

Status of San José and Santa Clara. The cities of San José and Santa Clara retain their temporary, interruptible status. The SFPUC has agreed to supply a combined annual average of 9 mgd to the two cities through 2028, in accordance with the terms of the WSA. The 9 mgd allocated to San José and Santa Clara is not a part of the Supply Assurance but is included within the wholesale portion of the Interim Supply Limitation of 184 mgd.

Creation of Transfer Market. The WSA contemplates the creation of a water transfer market that enhances the Wholesale Customers' ability to keep purchases within the amounts of their respective Interim Supply Allocations (as defined in the WSA). In addition, the Wholesale Customers may agree to the permanent transfer of portions of their Individual Supply Guarantees (including portions of their Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities). All such transfers are subject to SFPUC approval regarding operational and Raker Act concerns. In 2017, the City of Mountain View ("**Mountain View**") agreed to a permanent transfer of 1.0 mgd of its Individual Supply Guarantee to the City of East Palo Alto ("**East Palo Alto**"). Subsequently in 2018, the City of Palo Alto ("**Palo Alto**") agreed to a permanent transfer of 0.5 mgd of its Individual Supply Guarantee to East Palo Alto.

Enforcement of Interim Supply Limitation. Commencing in Fiscal Year 2011-12, the SFPUC established a volume-based "Environmental Enhancement Surcharge" to enforce the Interim Supply Limitation. The Environmental Enhancement Surcharge would apply only if combined retail and wholesale water deliveries from the Regional Water System watersheds exceed 265 mgd. Proceeds of the Environmental Enhancement Surcharge will be placed in a restricted reserve fund to be used only for specific environmental restoration and enhancement measures in the SFPUC's Sierra and local watersheds, such as those identified in the Watershed Environmental Improvement Program. Specific restoration and enhancement projects would be selected by the SFPUC and BAWSCA, following input from environmental stakeholders and other interested members of the public. No surcharges have been imposed, and as discussed above, it appears unlikely that any surcharges will be imposed.

Other Significant Provisions. The WSA also contains the following provisions:

- The SFPUC agrees to operate system reservoirs in a manner that assigns higher priority to the delivery of water to the Bay Area and the environment than to generation of hydroelectric power.

- The "Shortage Allocation Plan," which establishes an allocation of water between the Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers to be applied during droughts, and governs drought shortages of up to 20%.

- Drought pricing and emergency rate increases are allowed.

2028 Water Supply Decisions. Subject to completion of necessary CEQA review and the exercise of retained discretion by the SFPUC to reject or modify proposed projects, the WSA currently requires the SFPUC to make decisions by December 31, 2028 as follows:

- Whether to make San José and Santa Clara permanent customers to the extent that the SFPUC determines that long-term Regional Water System supplies are available.

- Whether to provide water in excess of the Supply Assurance to meet the Wholesale Customers' projected future water demands until the year 2040, and whether to offer a corresponding increase in the Supply Assurance.

Converting San José and Santa Clara to permanent, non-interruptible customers would require the SFPUC to secure 9.0 mgd of additional water supply, reflecting historical deliveries. As noted above, San José and Santa Clara are currently temporary customers with interruptible status. The SFPUC is having ongoing discussions with San José and Santa Clara regarding a possible extension of the December 31, 2028 deadline. See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Water Supply Initiatives."

For a more detailed summary of the WSA, see "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT."

Individual Water Supply Contracts. While the WSA establishes the rate-setting mechanism and the overall supply assurance level for the Wholesale Customers, each wholesale customer (including Cordilleras Mutual Water Company) has an individual water supply contract with the City that defines the terms and conditions (including, among others, the point of delivery and service area) by which water is supplied to each such wholesale customer.

Minimum Annual Purchases. Pursuant to the WSA, four Wholesale Customers – Alameda County Water District and the cities of Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale – may purchase water from sources other than the SFPUC, provided that each agency purchases a specified minimum annual quantity of water from the SFPUC ("**Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity**"). If one of the four customers does not meet its Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity in a particular Fiscal Year, it must pay the SFPUC for the difference between its metered water purchases during the Fiscal Year and its Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity. Due to the most recent drought in Water Years 2020, 2021 and 2022, and the corresponding call for voluntary rationing from the wholesale and retail customers, the SFPUC waived the minimum purchase requirements for these agencies for Fiscal Years 2021-22 and 2022-23, but reinstated the requirements in Fiscal Year 2023-24 once the SWRCB no longer required the SFPUC to implement the Shortage Level 1 or Shortage Level 2 drought response actions of its Water Shortage Contingency Plan. In Fiscal Year

2023-24, the City of Mountain View and the City of Milpitas did not meet their minimum purchase requirements and were assessed charges for imputed water sales of $3,951,456 and $10,378, respectively. The WSA includes a mechanism that allows a Wholesale Customer with a Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity to transfer a portion of that quantity to another Wholesale Customer at the same time that it transfers a portion of its Individual Supply Guarantee to that other Wholesale Customer. See "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT – Restrictions on Purchases of Water from Others; Minimum Annual Purchases."

In 2023, to recognize and support these four Wholesale Customers' water efficiency and conservation efforts, along with their investment in recycled water, the SFPUC proposed adjusting the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities to better align with current water demands. This amendment to the WSA will, among other changes, reduce the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities for Alameda County Water District and the cities of Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale and temporarily reduce the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities for the first year immediately following the end of a drought or other period of water shortage during which the SFPUC had waived the minimum purchase requirements. The Commission approved the amendment to the WSA on May 13, 2025, and the SFPUC anticipates that all of the Wholesale Customers will approve such amendment within the next six months.

Retail Deliveries

Retail Service Area and Customer Base. The SFPUC's Retail Customers include the residents, businesses and industries located within the corporate boundaries of San Francisco. In addition to these customers, retail water service is also provided to other customers located outside of San Francisco, such as the Town of Sunol, SFO, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Castlewood Country Club and Groveland Community Services District. The SFPUC's Retail Customers have been metered since 1916.

Residential Water Use. Due to the moderate climate and the high-density housing in San Francisco, much of the water use within San Francisco is indoors. For San Francisco's many multi-family units, the average outdoor water use is considerably lower than the statewide residential outdoor average water use. Residential per capita water usage has been less than 50 gallons per person per day since 2011, and is currently averaging a little under 42 gallons per person per day. By comparison, the statewide average residential per capita water use in calendar year 2023 was 78 gallons per person per day.

Non-Residential Water Use. Non-residential water use includes all sectors of water users not designated as residential, such as manufacturing, transportation, trade, finance, and government employment sectors, and the large services sector.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Historical Water Sales and Top Customers

Water Sales. The following table shows water sales to Retail Customers and wholesale customers for Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24.

TABLE 8
HISTORICAL WHOLESALE AND RETAIL WATER SALES
FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 THROUGH 2023-24
(IN MGD)

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2023-24% of Total
Retail Customers						
Multi-Family Residential	23.3	22.7	21.9	21.8	21.7	12.4%
Single-Family Residential	14.4	14.6	13.1	12.5	12.2	7.0
Commercial[1]	15.1	10.6	11.8	12.4	12.2	7.0
Industrial	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Municipal[2]	3.4	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.7	1.6
Suburban Retail[3]	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.9	1.7
Retail water sales	**59.4**	**53.6**	**52.4**	**52.0**	**51.8**	**29.7%**
Wholesale Customers						
California Water Service[4]	29.0	29.6	29.0	26.4	25.9	14.9%
City of Hayward	14.2	14.5	14.0	12.9	13.1	7.5
Alameda County Water District	7.7	9.5	9.4	9.7	9.9	5.7
City of Sunnyvale	9.4	9.7	8.9	8.1	9.5	5.4
City of Palo Alto	9.7	9.8	9.6	8.6	8.9	5.1
City of Redwood City	8.8	8.6	7.9	7.2	7.7	4.4
City of Mountain View	7.6	7.9	7.4	6.7	7.4	4.2
City of Milpitas	6.1	5.4	4.8	4.5	5.3	3.0
City of San José	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9	2.2
Estero Municipal Improvement District	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.5	3.7	2.1
All Other Wholesale Customers	31.0	31.5	29.5	26.4	27.3	15.8
Wholesale water sales[5]	**132.0**	**135.0**	**128.5**	**117.8**	**122.6**	**70.3%**
Total water sales[5]	**191.4**	**188.6**	**180.9**	**169.8**	**174.4**	
% Change from prior year[5]	3.9%	-1.6%	-4.1%	-6.1%	3.0%	

(1) Includes docks and ships under Commercial.
(2) The Municipal category includes the San Bruno Jail, a City department located outside San Francisco, and master metered Treasure Island water sales. Current Treasure Island usage represents purchases by the Treasure Island Development Authority and various commercial, residential, and governmental lessees. As new development is completed on Treasure Island, customers open individual accounts under the appropriate commercial or residential line items, and the master-metered amount is reduced accordingly.
(3) SFO is included as a Suburban Retail Customer because SFO receives water directly from the Water Enterprise.
(4) California Water Service Company, Daly City, and San Bruno participate in the conjunctive use groundwater program, and receive a bill credit for regional water system usage in-lieu of groundwater pumping. Totals reported in this table exclude water credited to the SFPUC storage account under such conjunctive use program.
(5) Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: SFPUC; compiled from Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2024 and 2023.

Wholesale and retail sales figures do not include "nonrevenue water." Nonrevenue water includes system leaks and unbilled water (*i.e.*, water used for firefighting, flushing system pipes, or a small volume of unbilled metered municipal use). Over the last three Fiscal Years, nonrevenue water has averaged approximately 7.7% of retail water sales per year. For more information regarding factors that impact water sales, see "– Recent Factors Impacting Retail Water Sales."

Top Ten Retail and Top Ten Wholesale Customers. The following table sets forth the top ten Retail Customers and top ten wholesale customers based on water sales revenues for Fiscal Year 2023-24.

TABLE 9
TOP TEN RETAIL CUSTOMERS
AND TOP TEN WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS
FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024

	Water Sales Revenue (In Thousands)	Percent of all Water Revenues	Percent of Wholesale Customer Revenues[1]	Percent of Retail Customer Revenues[1]
Retail Customers				
San Francisco International Airport[2]	$ 6,048	0.9%	N/A	1.9%
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	2,935	0.5	N/A	0.9
Recreation and Parks Department	1,697	0.3	N/A	0.5
Parkmerced Investors Properties, LLC	2,472	0.4	N/A	0.8
University of California, San Francisco	2,279	0.4	N/A	0.7
NASA Shared Services Center, LLC	2,765	0.4	N/A	0.9
Golden Gate National Cemetery	1,731	0.3	N/A	0.5
Public Health Department	1,415	0.2	N/A	0.4
San Francisco State University	997	0.2	N/A	0.3
1169 Market Street	812	0.1	N/A	0.3
Total:	$23,151	3.6%	N/A	7.3%
Wholesale Customers				
California Water Service Company	$ 74,681	11.5%	22.3%	N/A
City of Hayward	35,828	5.5	10.7	N/A
City of Palo Alto	24,600	3.8	7.4	N/A
Alameda County Water District	27,606	4.2	8.3	N/A
City of Sunnyvale	25,779	4.0	7.7	N/A
City of Redwood City	20,941	3.2	6.3	N/A
City of Mountain View	20,068	3.1	6.0	N/A
City of Daly City	11,866	1.8	3.6	N/A
City of Milpitas	14,168	2.2	4.2	N/A
City of San José	10,674	1.6	3.2	N/A
Total:	$266,211	40.9%	79.7%	N/A

(1) Percentages based on total wholesale revenues of $334.2 million and total retail revenues of $316.0 million.
(2) Represents water sales to customers through the City enterprise fund for San Francisco International Airport, which is paid through the City's inter-departmental billing system.
Source: SFPUC.

Recent Factors Impacting Retail Water Sales

Several factors have contributed to the SFPUC's reduced retail water sales in recent years, including, but not limited to, certain developments in the local San Francisco economy and weather conditions. For example, there has been a general decline in San Francisco's population in recent years due to, among other factors, widespread business closures, worker migration out of San Francisco due in part to remote work policies, and a general decline in tourism, all of which can be attributed in some part to the enduring impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, according to the California Department of Finance, the population in San Francisco decreased by 3.5% between April 1, 2020 and January 1, 2024. In addition, office attendance stayed between 40-45% of pre-pandemic levels in fiscal year 2023-24, and office vacancy rates were approximately 33% in fiscal year 2023-24.

In addition, weather conditions and actions taken in response thereto over the past several years have resulted in reduced water usage. Water Years 2020, 2021 and 2022 represent the driest three-year period on record for California. During that time, in response to calls for voluntary statewide water use reductions and emergency regulations adopted by the SWRCB, the SFPUC declared a local water shortage emergency, called for voluntary systemwide water use reductions of up to 11% compared to baseline water use during Fiscal Year 2019-20 in

accordance with the SFPUC's Water Shortage Contingency Plan, adopted by the Commission in June 2021, and the Water Shortage Allocation Plan, and implemented a drought surcharge of up to 5% on all retail water and wastewater volumetric rates. As shown in Table 8, water sales declined during this period. Following California's remarkably wet winter in Water Year 2023, the SFPUC ended the local water shortage emergency declaration and the drought surcharge in May 2023 and ended the call for voluntary systemwide water use reductions in June 2023. While removal of drought restrictions generally increases water usage, years with greater-than-normal rainfall may see declines in water sales as customers typically reduce water use for outdoor irrigation. In the San Francisco retail service area, with its low outdoor irrigation usage and high levels of water conservation, there has been limited change in total water sales from the ending of drought restrictions, with Fiscal Year 2023-24 retail water sales showing very little change from the prior fiscal year.

Current Water Conditions

Water Year 2025 has been normal for both precipitation and snowpack. As of May 19, 2025, Water Year 2025 precipitation for upcountry area totals approximately 28.85 inches, which is 93.34% of normal annual total, and Water Year 2025 precipitation for local area totals approximately 22.62 inches, which is 96.88% of normal annual total.

The following graph shows precipitation levels at Hetch Hetchy as of May 19, 2025 for Water Year 2025, as compared to Water Year 2024 (most recent full Water Year), Water Year 1983 (wettest year on record), Water Year 2015 (driest year on record), and the median between Water Years 1991-2020.

GRAPH 1
PRECIPITATION AT HETCH HETCHY
(AS OF MAY 19, 2025)



Source: SFPUC.

The following graph shows snowpack conditions at Hetch Hetchy as of May 19, 2025 for Water Year 2025, as compared to Water Year 2024 (most recent full Water Year), Water Year 2023 (most amount of snowpack on record), Water Year 2015 (least amount of snowpack on record), and the median between Water Years 1991-2020.

GRAPH 2
UPCOUNTRY SNOWPACK
(AS OF MAY 19, 2025)



Source: SFPUC.

Curtailment Actions by the State Water Resources Control Board

The SWRCB sought to curtail the exercise of water rights in 2014 and 2015 in response to the 2011-2017 drought. In 2014, the SWRCB enacted emergency regulations for the purpose of curtailing the exercise of junior, post-1914 water rights. The City was not impacted by these 2014 regulations as the City relies primarily on senior, pre-1914 water rights to divert water from the Tuolumne River. In 2015, the SWRCB again sought to curtail the exercise of water rights, but this time, the SWRCB issued curtailment notices to thousands of water rights holders across the State, including to senior, pre-1914 water rights holders, and subsequently prosecuted several enforcement proceedings. The City's water rights were never curtailed. The City did, however, participate in one of the enforcement proceedings before the SWRCB – the Administrative Civil Liability complaint against Byron Bethany Irrigation District ("**BBID**") – in order to challenge the SWRCB's assertion that it has jurisdiction to curtail pre-1914 water rights. The SWRCB ultimately concluded the prosecution team had failed to carry its burden, and thus, dismissed the enforcement proceeding against BBID on the merits (the SWRCB also dismissed its enforcement proceeding against the West Side Irrigation District in the same order). However, in its order, the SWRCB concluded that it may exercise its enforcement authority to issue curtailment orders against pre-1914 water rights holders if water is unavailable under the diverter's priority of right. On September 2, 2015, the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority ("**SJTA**"), a joint powers authority then comprised of five member agencies, including the City by and through the SFPUC, filed suit seeking writ relief from the SWRCB's order. The SJTA argued that the SWRCB's order in the BBID enforcement proceeding

is inconsistent with established appellate case law and exceeded SWRCB's authority under the applicable law. Two other challenges to the SWRCB's order were filed and these three challenges, along with other pending challenges to the SWRCB's 2014 and 2015 curtailment actions, were assigned to a coordination judge in Santa Clara Superior Court. Judgment was entered in favor of SJTA and other plaintiffs on June 6, 2019, and, on September 12, 2022, the Sixth District Court of Appeal upheld this decision.

In August 2021, the SWRCB again adopted emergency regulations to curtail water rights throughout the Bay-Delta, which the SWRCB then readopted in August 2022. The SWRCB issued orders notifying the City that it may periodically curtail all of the City's water rights on the Tuolumne River subject to water unavailability, beginning August 2021. In response to high precipitation levels in late 2022 and early 2023, the SWRCB began lifting all curtailments, and, on March 24, 2023, Governor Newsom issued an executive order lifting the majority of the provisions of his earlier drought-related executive orders. By June 2023, the SWRCB's emergency curtailment regulations terminated by their own one-year term. On August 19, 2022, SJTA, again, filed a lawsuit challenging the legality of the emergency regulations. Separately, on September 20, 2021, the City filed a petition for reconsideration with the SWRCB on the curtailment orders for SFPUC's water right diversions on the Tuolumne River, which among other issues, informed the SWRCB that it was using incorrect place of use and priority date information for the City's water rights. On October 17, 2022, the SWRCB favorably resolved these place of use and priority date issues. The SFPUC is unable to predict whether future SWRCB initiatives to curtail the exercise of pre-1914 water rights might affect water supplies available to the SFPUC. See "REGULATORY MATTERS – Bay-Delta Water Quality Standards" and "– FERC Proceeding to Increase Flows in the Lower Tuolumne River."

Projected Demand

Wholesale Demand. In 2022, BAWSCA updated its 2020 Regional Water Demand and Conservation Projections Study, which provided demand projections of its member agencies (the Wholesale Customers) using a combination of two different models: (1) an econometric (or statistical) model developed for each member agency and (2) the Demand Side Management Least Cost Planning Decision Support System (also known as the DSS Model). In its 2022 update titled "Regional Water Demand and Conservation Projections Update," BAWSCA sought to meet two objectives: (1) to reflect new data that became available since the 2020 study's completion and (2) to better understand and quantify uncertainty associated with demand estimates and the variables that influence water demands, such as population, employment, climate change, housing densification, landscape transformation, conservation adoption, and rate increases. BAWSCA's population projections for its member agencies are based on each member agency's population projections as provided in their individual 2020 Urban Water Management Plans, the Association of Bay Area Governments ("**ABAG**") Plan Bay Area 2040 data, and Draft ABAG Plan Bay Area 2050 data. The forecast methodology and resulting projections are documented in the Regional Water Demand and Conservation Projections Update and support implementation of BAWSCA's Long-Term Reliable Water Supply Strategy (the "**BAWSCA Strategy**"). The BAWSCA Strategy's projections indicate that demands by the Wholesale Customers for Regional Water System supplies through 2045 will be significantly less than anticipated at the time the WSIP was adopted in 2008.

Water supplied by the SFPUC to the Wholesale Customers is metered. The total projected water demands of the Wholesale Customers, as compiled in the BAWSCA Annual Survey for Fiscal Year 2023-24, are shown in Table 10.

In Fiscal Year 2023-24, the Wholesale Customers collectively received approximately 126.56 mgd, or 68.5% of their water supply, from the Regional Water System. By Fiscal Year 2045-46, the Wholesale Customers are projected to receive approximately 170.49 mgd, or 64.5% of their water supply, from the Regional Water System. The remaining sources, including ground water, recycled water, surface water, additional active conservation and other sources are projected to total approximately 93.89 mgd.

TABLE 10
PROJECTED WHOLESALE CUSTOMER WATER DEMAND AND SUPPLIES[(1)]
(IN MGD)

	2025-26	2030-31	2035-36	2040-41	2045-46
Wholesale Customer Purchases from the Regional Water System[(2)]	149.53	155.59	160.26	165.01	170.49
Other Supplies[(3)]	72.97	71.93	77.35	83.60	93.89
Total Wholesale Customer Demand	222.50	227.52	237.61	248.61	264.38

(1) Does not include wholesale customer Cordilleras Mutual Water Company, which is not a BAWSCA member agency and not a party to the WSA.

(2) This projected demand includes increased deliveries to interruptible customers, the cities of San José and Santa Clara, as well as to other permanent customers such as East Palo Alto.

(3) Estimated as the difference between the "Total Wholesale Customer Demand" and the "Wholesale Customer Purchases from the Regional Water System."

Note: Amounts set forth in the table are projections. Actual results may differ materially from these projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS."

Source: SFPUC; compiled from BAWSCA Annual Survey Fiscal Year 2023-24, dated April 2025.

The SFPUC plans to meet its contractual obligation of serving the Wholesale Customers Supply Assurance (as defined herein) of 184 mgd. In addition to the Supply Assurance, the SFPUC provides 9 mgd to San José and Santa Clara as interruptible customers, which is the level of demand that is reflected through 2046 in the table above. East Palo Alto was previously projecting a 1.5 mgd supply shortfall. In 2017, Mountain View agreed to a permanent transfer of 1.0 mgd of its Individual Supply Guarantee (defined below) to East Palo Alto. Subsequently, in 2018, Palo Alto agreed to a permanent transfer of 0.5 mgd of its Individual Supply Guarantee to East Palo Alto. See "– Wholesale Deliveries – *Creation of Transfer Market*" and "– *2028 Water Supply Decisions*."

Retail Demand. Municipal retail water service providers are required to prepare an Urban Water Management Plan every five years. The purpose of the Urban Water Management Plan process is to project future retail water demand with a view to facilitating the planning necessary to assure that future water supply will be adequate to meet future demand. By reason of the periodic nature of the Urban Water Management Plan process, the SFPUC's current Urban Water Management Plan may not reflect the most current information. Further, for financial planning and rate-setting purposes, the SFPUC projects water sales conservatively. As a consequence, demand projections derived from the SFPUC's Urban Water Management Plans will not match the water sales projections used for financial planning purposes.

The SFPUC's current retail demand projections are based on the 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections, prepared in September 2023 (the "**2023 Interim Water Demand Projections**"), which reflect slightly higher housing projections than those used in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, adopted by the SFPUC in June 2021 (the "**2020 Urban Water Management Plan**"). Both the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan and 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections used an econometric model that incorporates socioeconomic factors to forecast demand, which has become a more prevalent methodology for forecasting demand among urban water utilities and managers. The econometric model combined 10 years (2010-2020) of historical San Francisco account-level water usage data with property characteristics, demographic characteristics and historical climate data. For the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, demand was projected based on housing and employment forecasts available at that time from the San Francisco Planning Department. Housing projections were based on the City's housing plan objective of producing an average of 5,000 housing units per year with adjustments for certain large development plans. Employment projections were based on the Planning Department's Land Use Allocation 2017, a City-specific refinement of the ABAG's growth forecasts, and ABAG Projections 2017, which reflect assumed growth from ABAG's Plan Bay Area and Sustainable Communities Strategy Jobs-Housing Connections Scenario. The resulting employment projections anticipate approximately 16% of growth in the number of jobs between 2020 and 2045. After, and unrelated to, adoption of the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, the San Francisco Planning Commission certified the Housing Element 2022 Update (the "**Housing Element 2022 Update**") Environmental Impact Report in November 2022. The Housing Element 2022 Update Environmental Impact Report, which supported the City's adoption of the Housing Element 2022 Update in January 2023, assumed slightly higher housing unit projections than

those used in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, but still in line with the objective to produce an average of 5,000 housing units per year. However, the SFPUC determined that its 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, which was completed prior to recent developments that have affected San Francisco's population and the local economy, no longer accounted for all projected retail water demands and subsequently prepared the 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections in September 2023 to reflect housing growth consistent with the Housing Element 2022 Update. The resulting demand projections increased by about 0.6 to 0.8% compared to those in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan.

Demand is forecasted to increase steadily through Fiscal Year 2044-45, with more rapid growth happening in the later years of the projection period. After accounting for the projected conservation savings, the total retail demand (excluding water loss) is projected to increase by about 22% between Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2044-45. Although population and total retail water demand are projected to increase, residential per capita water usage is forecasted to decrease.

The water demand projections show that, throughout the retail service area, single family residential water use is expected to decrease by 7% and multi-family residential water use is projected to increase by 46% between Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2044-45. Non-residential water use is projected to increase by 13% between Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2044-45. These projections will be updated in summer 2025 as the SFPUC compiles information for the next Urban Water Management Plan, which will take into consideration the City's housing plan objectives available at that time.

The following table sets forth retail water demand projections, which are based on the 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections.

TABLE 11
PROJECTED RETAIL WATER DEMAND
(IN MGD)

	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045
In City Residential Demand (Single and Multiple Family)	38.0	39.7	41.8	44.4	47.1
In City Non-residential (Business/Industrial/Municipal Demands)[1]	22.9	22.9	22.8	23.1	23.6
Subtotal – In City Retail	**60.9**	**62.6**	**64.6**	**67.5**	**70.6**
In City Water Loss[2]	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Subtotal – In City Losses	**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**
Suburban Residential	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Suburban Non-residential[3]	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Groveland CSD	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Subtotal – Suburban Retail[4]	**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.4**	**4.4**
Total – Retail Demand	**71.3**	**73.0**	**75.0**	**77.9**	**81.1**
Local Water Supplies	**3.5**	**4.9**	**5.9**	**6.9**	**6.9**
Net Retail Demand from Regional Water System	**67.8**	**68.1**	**69.1**	**71.0**	**74.1**

(1) Includes Builders & Contractors, Docks & Shipping, and all dedicated irrigation.
(2) Water losses include both apparent and real losses.
(3) Includes the San Francisco County Jail, San Francisco International Airport, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Castlewood Country Club, Sunol Valley Golf Course, and other non-residential suburban or municipal accounts.
(4) Suburban retail water losses are considered to be negligible.

Note: Amounts set forth in this table are projections. Actual results may differ materially from these projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS."

Sources: 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, released July 2021; 2023 Interim Water Demand Projections, released September 2023.

Cybersecurity

City Measures. The City, like many other large public and private entities, relies on a large and complex technology environment to conduct its operations, and faces multiple cybersecurity threats including, but not limited to, hacking, viruses, malware and other attacks on its computing and other digital networks and systems. Cybersecurity incidents could result from unintentional events, or from deliberate attacks by unauthorized entities or individuals attempting to gain access to the City's systems technology for the purposes of misappropriating assets or information or causing operational disruption and damage. To mitigate the risk of business operations impact and/or damage from cybersecurity incidents or cyber-attacks, the City invests in multiple forms of cybersecurity and operational safeguards. In 2016, the City adopted a City-wide Cybersecurity Policy (the "**City Cyber Policy**") to support, maintain, and secure critical infrastructure and data systems. The objectives of the City Cyber Policy include protecting critical infrastructure and information, managing risk, improving cyber security event detection and remediation, and facilitating cyber awareness across all City departments. The City's Department of Technology has established a cybersecurity team to work across all City departments, including the SFPUC, to implement the City Cyber Policy. The City Cyber Policy is reviewed periodically. The City has also appointed a City Chief Information Security Officer (the "**CCISO**"), who is directly responsible for understanding the business and related cybersecurity needs of the City's departments, including the SFPUC. The CCISO is responsible for identifying, evaluating, responding, and reporting on information security risks in a manner that meets compliance and regulatory requirements, and aligns with and supports the risk posture of the City.

SFPUC Measures. Federal agencies have recently reported that critical infrastructure sectors, such as water and wastewater, may be specific targets of cybersecurity threat actors. The occurrence of military conflicts or terrorist activities, including cyber terrorism, could adversely impact the Water Enterprise's operations and finances. For example, cyberattacks directed at water sector operations could damage water transmission, treatment, distribution or storage assets, causing operational malfunctions and outages, and resulting in costly recovery and remediation efforts. In January 2024, the SFPUC's system was targeted by a suspected foreign state-sponsored threat actor. The SFPUC's prompt execution of its cybersecurity incident response plan, as further described below, successfully contained the incident without any significant impact.

The SFPUC abides by the City Cyber Policy and maintains its own cybersecurity and disaster recovery program (the "**SFPUC Cybersecurity Program**") that is based on the National Institute of Standards and Technology cybersecurity guidance. In addition, control networks for the Water Enterprise and the Wastewater Enterprise adhere to the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency's ("**CISA**") Cross-Sector Cybersecurity Performance Goals, as recommended by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (the "**USEPA**"). Control networks for the Power Enterprise adhere to the North American Electric Reliability Corporation critical infrastructure protection controls. In anticipation of future USEPA regulatory requirements, the SFPUC has completed operational cybersecurity assessments in alignment with CISA's cross-sector performance objectives.

The SFPUC has also appointed a Chief Information Security Officer (the "**CISO**"), who reports to the SFPUC's Chief Information Officer. The SFPUC's cybersecurity team also includes dedicated information technology (IT) and operational technology (OT) staff, as well as third-party specialists who perform a variety of cybersecurity functions. Technology vendors undergo thorough security assessments during procurement, and any procured technology is continuously monitored through the SFPUC Cybersecurity Program.

The SFPUC Cybersecurity Program employs industry-standard cybersecurity solutions and multiple technical controls, including: network segmentation of control environments, secure remote access and domain name system (DNS) protocols, modern authentication methods, secure asset disposal procedures, end user controls, and timely removal of system and facility access for departing SFPUC employees. In addition, the SFPUC has implemented industry-leading technology that provides real-time threat monitoring and response capabilities across all corporate and operational environments. These response capabilities include a cybersecurity incident response plan, incident response services, incident responders, and a cybersecurity insurance policy. The SFPUC's cybersecurity incident response plan is part of the SFPUC's continuity of operation plan, which describes the SFPUC's strategy for ensuring continued delivery of essential services during a disruption in normal operations, and part of the City's Department of Emergency Management Emergency Support Function 18 program, which details the City's operational response in the event of a cybersecurity incident.

The SFPUC Cybersecurity Program is periodically and independently reviewed for effectiveness, most recently in June 2022. The next review is scheduled for September 2025. Pursuant to the SFPUC's policies, the City Services Auditor and independent cybersecurity auditors perform extensive penetration and vulnerability assessment on the SFPUC's business and control networks. In addition, the City Services Auditor conducts annual cybersecurity maturity assessments. Like many other large public and private entities, the SFPUC is continually identifying aging infrastructure and managing infrastructure lifecycle.

See also "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operation – *Cybersecurity*."

Climate Change

Impact on City of San Francisco. Numerous scientific studies on global climate change show that, among other effects on the global ecosystem, sea levels will rise, extreme temperatures will become more common, and extreme weather events will become more frequent as a result of increasing global temperatures attributable to atmospheric pollution.

The 2018 Fourth National Climate Assessment and the 2023 Fifth National Climate Assessment, each published by the United States Global Change Research Program, find that more frequent and intense extreme weather and climate-related events, as well as changes in average climate conditions, are expected to continue to damage infrastructure, ecosystems and social systems. Both reports state that rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property and regional economies and industries that depend on natural resources and favorable climate conditions. Disruptions could include more frequent and longer-lasting power outages, fuel shortages and service disruptions. Both reports state that the continued increase in the frequency and extent of high-tide flooding due to sea level rise threatens coastal public infrastructure. Both reports also state that expected increases in the severity and frequency of heavy precipitation events will affect inland infrastructure, including access to roads, the viability of bridges and the safety of pipelines.

Sea levels will continue to rise in the future due to the increasing temperature of the oceans causing thermal expansion and growing ocean volume from glaciers and ice caps melting into the ocean. Between 1854 and 2016, the sea level rose about nine inches according to the tidal gauge at Fort Point, a location underneath the Golden Gate Bridge. Weather and tidal patterns, including 100-year or more storms and king tides, may exacerbate the effects of climate-related sea level rise. Coastal areas like San Francisco are at risk of substantial flood damage over time, affecting private development and public infrastructure, including roads, utilities, emergency services, schools, and parks. As a result, the City could lose considerable tax revenues and many residents, businesses, and governmental operations along the waterfront could be displaced. The City may elect to mitigate these effects to maintain its current shoreline and protect critical infrastructure at a potentially significant cost.

Adapting to sea level rise is a key component of the City's policies. The City and its enterprise departments have been preparing for future sea level rise for many years and have issued a number of public reports. For example, in March 2016, the City released a report entitled "Sea Level Rise Action Plan," identifying geographic zones at risk of sea level rise and providing a framework for adaptation strategies to confront these risks. That study shows an upper range of end-of-century projections for permanent sea level rise, including the effects of temporary flooding due to a 100-year storm, of up to 108 inches above the 2015 average high tide. To implement this plan, the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, co-chaired by the Planning Department and Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, joined the Port, the SFPUC and other public agencies in moving several initiatives forward. This included a Citywide Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Consequences Assessment to identify and evaluate sea level rise impacts across the City and in various neighborhoods that was released in February 2020.

In April 2017, the Working Group of the California Ocean Protection Council Science Advisory Team (in collaboration with several state agencies, including the California Natural Resource Agency, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and the California Energy Commission) published a report that was formally adopted in March 2018, entitled "Rising Seas in California: An Update on Sea Level Rise Science" (the "**Sea Level Rise Report**") to provide a new synthesis of the state of science regarding sea level rise. The Sea Level Rise Report provides the basis for State guidance to State and local agencies, entitled "State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance: 2018 Update" (the "**2018 Update**"). The 2018 Update provides guidance for incorporating sea level rise into design, planning, permitting, construction, investment and other decisions. Among many findings, the Sea Level Rise Report indicates

that the effects of sea level rise are already being felt in coastal California with more extensive coastal flooding during storms, exacerbated tidal flooding, and increased coastal erosion. In addition, the report notes that the rate of ice sheet loss from Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets poses a particular risk of sea level rise for the California coastline. An update of both the Sea Level Rise Report and the 2018 Update was adopted by the State of California in 2024. This update, contained in a single document entitled "State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance: 2024 Science & Policy Update," revised findings regarding best available science and updated guidance to State and local agencies, superseding the 2018 Update. Though high-end projections of sea level rise were reduced based on new science, the fundamental findings of the more recent reports as well as the specifics cited above agreed with those of the previous reports.

In March 2020, a consortium of State and local agencies, led by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, released a detailed study entitled, "Adapting to Rising Tides Bay Area: Regional Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Adaptation Study," on how sea level rise could alter the Bay Area. The study states that a 48-inch increase in the bay's water level in coming decades could cause more than 100,000 Bay Area jobs to be relocated, nearly 30,000 lower-income residents to be displaced, and 68,000 acres of ecologically valuable shoreline habitat to be lost. The study further argues that without a far-sighted, nine-county response, the region's economic and transportation systems could be undermined along with the environment. For example, runways at SFO could largely be under water.

The City has already incorporated site specific adaption plans in the conditions of approval for certain large waterfront development projects, such as the Candlestick/Hunters Point Shipyard, Treasure Island, Pier 70 and Mission Rock projects. Also, the City has partnered with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to fortify the Port's seawall from sea level rise. A draft plan estimates the total cost of that project at $13.5 billion; and, subject to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Congressional approval, 65% of the cost would be eligible for federal funding. The City is developing a financing strategy to provide the remaining funds, including using funding from the November 2018 approved Proposition A, authorizing the issuance of up to $425 million in general obligation bonds for repair and improvement projects on the seawall.

Portions of the San Francisco Bay Area, including San Francisco, are built on fill that was placed over saturated silty clay known as "Bay Mud." Bay Mud is soft and compressible, and the consolidation of the Bay Mud under the weight of the existing fill is ongoing. A report issued in March 2018 by researchers at the University of California, Berkeley ("**UC Berkeley**") and the University of Arizona suggests that flooding risk from climate change could be exacerbated in the San Francisco Bay Area due to the sinking or settling of the ground surface, known as subsidence. The study claims that the risk of subsidence is more significant for certain parts of San Francisco built on fill.

Projections of the effects of global climate change on San Francisco are complex and depend on many factors that are outside the City's control. The various scientific studies that forecast climate change and its adverse effects, including sea level rise and flooding risk, are based on assumptions contained in such studies, but actual events may vary materially. Also, the scientific understanding of climate change and its effects continues to evolve. Accordingly, the City is unable to forecast when sea level rise or other adverse effects of climate change (e.g., the occurrence and frequency of 100-year storm events and king tides) will occur. In particular, the City cannot predict the timing or precise magnitude of adverse economic effects, including, without limitation, material adverse effects on the business operations or financial condition of the City and the local economy during the term of the 2025DEF Bonds. While the effects of climate change may be mitigated by the City's past and future investment in adaptation strategies, the City can give no assurance about the net effects of those strategies and whether the City will take additional adaptive mitigation measures. If necessary, such additional measures could require significant capital resources.

In September 2017, the San Francisco City Attorney filed a lawsuit on behalf of the People of the State of California in San Francisco Superior Court against the five largest investor-owned oil companies seeking to have the companies pay into an abatement fund to help fund infrastructure for climate change adaptation. Following litigation regarding defendants' removal of the case to federal court, the City's case was remanded to and coordinated with similar municipal lawsuits and the State of California's lawsuit in San Francisco Superior Court in 2024. In June 2024, the San Francisco City Attorney filed the current amended complaint seeking abatement funds, damages, and other remedies. The Superior Court has since held that personal jurisdiction is appropriate over non-resident defendants sued in the City's case and denied an "anti-SLAPP" motion to strike by one of the defendants. While the City believes

that the claims in this lawsuit are meritorious, it can give no assurance regarding whether the lawsuit will be successful and obtain the requested relief from the courts, or contributions to the abatement fund from the defendant oil companies.

Impact on SFPUC Water Enterprise. The issue of climate change has become an important factor in water resources planning in the State, and is being considered during planning for the Water Enterprise. The preponderance of evidence indicates that increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases have caused and will continue to cause a rise in temperatures around the world, which will result in a wide range of changes in climate patterns. Moreover, there is strong evidence that a warming trend occurred during the latter part of the 20th century and will likely continue through the 21st century. These changes will have a direct effect on water resources in the State, and numerous studies on climate and water in the State have been conducted to determine the potential impacts. Based on these studies, climate change could result in the following types of water resources impacts in the State, including impacts on the Water Enterprise and associated watersheds:

- Reductions in the average annual snowpack due to a rise in the snowline and a shallower snowpack in the low- and medium-elevation zones, such as in the Tuolumne River basin, and a shift in snowmelt runoff to earlier in the year;

- Changes in the timing, intensity and annual variability of precipitation, and an increased amount of precipitation falling as rain instead of as snow;

- Long-term changes in watershed vegetation and increased incidence of wildfires that could degrade water quality;

- Sea level rise, which could cause inundation of Water Enterprise assets and/or an increase in saltwater intrusion into groundwater basins;

- Increased water temperatures with accompanying adverse effects on some fisheries and water quality; and

- Changes in urban water demand.

However, other than the general trends listed above, there is no clear scientific consensus on exactly how climate change will quantitatively affect SFPUC or State water supplies.

To help better understand the potential vulnerability of the SFPUC's Regional Water System to uncertain future conditions, the SFPUC partnered with the Water Research Foundation to develop a long-term vulnerability assessment of the Regional Water System, which was published in 2021 with an errata published in 2025 pertaining to a specific study finding. The study was conducted by the University of Massachusetts Hydrosystems Research Group with input from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, other climate scientists, and Deltares. The goal of the long-term vulnerability assessment was to help quantitatively and qualitatively assess to what extent climate change will be a threat to the Regional Water System in comparison to or in combination with other external drivers of change over the next 50 years (2020-2070). More specifically, the assessment aimed to answer the following questions: (1) Under what conditions and when will the Regional Water System no longer meet system performance criteria? (2) Is climate change the most important driver of vulnerability for the Regional Water System and if not, what is? While climate change is the driver of change that triggered this study, the intent was to understand the effects of climate change in the context of effects from other drivers of change on the Regional Water System. Overall, the study found that:

- Climate change exacerbates impacts from other external drivers of change and is not the single most important driver of vulnerability for the Regional Water System.

- The Regional Water System at a baseline demand of 227 mgd is resilient to changes in climate and most external drivers.

- The Regional Water System water supply performance declines with reductions in mean precipitation but is mostly insensitive to increases in temperature.

- The Regional Water System is more vulnerable to changes in demand and instream flow requirements than changes in mean annual temperature and precipitation.

- The Regional Water System is vulnerable to changes in mean climate when demand or instream flow requirements increase.

These findings are based on the following results:

- According to climate projections and expert elicitations of climate scientists, there is a central tendency of warming of +2°C and +4°C by 2040 and 2070 for Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 (which represents unmitigated global greenhouse gas emissions during the 21st century), respectively, with no clear direction of change in mean annual precipitation over the planning horizon.

- In the Hetch Hetchy watershed, by 2040, most projections and elicitations of warming estimate between +1°C and +4°C and for precipitation change between -5% and +5% compared to historical baseline; and by 2070 estimates of warming range between +3°C and +6°C and for precipitation between -15% and +15% (assuming Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5).

- Changes in hydrology due to climate change affect the Regional Water System's ability to meet water supply targets. At 227 mgd demand, the Regional Water System can sustain up to +4°C and -5% precipitation change before failing to meet targets for delivery reliability, frequency of 20% rationing, storage reliability and duration of rationing. At 227 mgd demand, the Regional Water System is resilient to all median climate projections for the planning horizon 2020-2070. Due to the limitations of the models, these results are likely understating the impact of climate change. Next steps will include improvements on these models to address the bias in the current versions.

- Precipitation change is an important driver for Regional Water System performance. A decrease of 10% or more will cause Regional Water System targets to be missed. The climate projections and expert elicitations show that such a change in precipitation is possible by 2040, although unlikely. The likelihood of this change increases toward 2070.

- The Regional Water System shows minor sensitivity to temperature change for the metrics evaluated in this study. Most metrics stay above target under warming conditions. However, warming conditions often magnify the loss in system performance if precipitation or demand change.

- Demand change appears to be a major driver of future Regional Water System performance. An increase in demand of approximately 16.7% (265 mgd) will lead to failure to meet rationing frequency targets under current climate conditions. At 265 mgd demand, the rationing frequency targets would be met if there is an increase in precipitation of 10%. If demand increases by 30%, the rationing target cannot be met even when precipitation increases by 40%, which is believed plausible but unlikely over the planning horizon.

- The Regional Water System is particularly vulnerable to the SWRCB's "Phase 1" Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan (see "REGULATORY MATTERS – Bay-Delta Water Quality Standards"), which represents a significant reduction in water available. Under all demand (including baseline demand of 227 mgd) and climate scenarios, the system reliability, defined as frequency of years without rationing, remains below 5%.

SFPUC hydrologists are involved in ongoing monitoring and research regarding climate change trends and will continue to monitor the changes and predictions, particularly as these changes relate to water system operations and management of the Water Enterprise.

Regarding sea level rise, the City has developed policies for considering the potential impact of sea level rise on City assets, "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise into Capital Planning" that requires all assets in the City's 10-year capital plan be evaluated for inundation under a variety of sea level rise scenarios plus a 100-year storm. The SFPUC has assets that are part of the Emergency Firefighting Water System (the "**Emergency Firefighting Water System**" or "**EFWS**"), also known as the Auxiliary Water Supply System, the supplementary and emergency water supply managed by the SFPUC. See "WATER FACILITIES – Emergency Firefighting Water System." These assets have projected functional lifespans of between 90 and 100 years. Several of these assets such as buried pipelines, fireboat manifolds, hydrants, and pump stations are in the potential inundation zone toward the end of the 21st century. The City, through its Sea Level Rise Action Plan, will be evaluating the best approaches and potential adaptive management plans for protecting EFWS assets, along with all other public and private assets potentially subject to inundation caused by sea level rise and large storms.

The SFPUC is a founding member of the Water Utility Climate Alliance (the "**WUCA**"), a group of 12 large water utilities collectively delivering drinking water to over 50 million people in the United States that is focused on collaboratively advancing water utility climate change adaptation. WUCA meets monthly by phone, maintains active projects and committees exploring adaptation best practices on a variety of subjects and features active participation of SFPUC staff.

Climate Action Plan

In September 2021, the City adopted a set of emissions reduction targets: achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions generated by the City by 2040 and reduce emissions associated with consumption of all goods and services in the City (regardless of where emissions originate) 80% by 2050. In December 2021, former Mayor Breed released the City's Climate Action Plan (the "**Climate Action Plan**") detailing the actions needed to accomplish these targets, developed through a multi-agency and stakeholder process led by the San Francisco Environment Department (the "**Environment Department**"). The Climate Action Plan is a roadmap of goals, strategies and actions to achieve emission reductions across six sectors: energy supply, building operations, transportation and land use, housing, responsible production and consumption, and healthy ecosystems. Key strategies include, but are not limited to, provision of 100% carbon-free energy, decarbonization of buildings, and increases in the public transit, active transportation, and vehicle electrification networks. In addition to reducing emissions to zero over the next 20 years, the Climate Action Plan strives to ensure all San Franciscans have the skills, knowledge, and resources to meet future interconnected challenges, including climate change. To do so, the proposed strategies aim to leverage community strengths, advance racial and social equity, and provide critical benefits to the entire community. The Climate Action Plan includes sections on funding and investment, monitoring and reporting. The City also maintains a public-facing reporting mechanism to keep stakeholders and residents informed on progress made against performance metrics laid out in the Climate Action Plan. The Environment Department contracted with the University of California, Berkeley, Center for Law, Energy & the Environment (the "**CLEE**") to assess options for funding the equitable implementation of the Climate Action Plan. CLEE released its report entitled "Funding San Francisco Climate Action" in November 2022.

In 2023, together with the Environment Department, the SFPUC released the San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021 – Water Supply Addendum 2023, which adds "water supply" as a seventh sector to the Climate Action Plan. The addendum focuses on how the City plans to address and secure water supplies that are impacted by multiple climate challenges, including climate change, by continuing to implement effective water conservation programs; deploying innovative ways to conserve, recover, and reuse water; and augmenting the SFPUC's Regional Water System by investing in alternative water supply projects.

WATER FACILITIES

General

The facilities of the Water Enterprise consist of Regional Water System facilities and In-City Distribution System facilities. The Regional Water System evolved through the development of two separate water systems: the Spring Valley Water Company system and the Hetch Hetchy Project.

- The predecessor to the Spring Valley Water Company was established in 1858, developing a spring and several creeks into a local water system. It expanded over the years with the construction of Pilarcitos Reservoir, followed by San Andreas Reservoir, Upper Crystal Springs Reservoir and Lower Crystal Springs Dam, all on the Peninsula in San Mateo County. Later the company extended its system to additional sources on Alameda Creek in Alameda County and expanded its service area to include additional Peninsula and South Bay customers. The City acquired the local supplies and retail distribution system of the Spring Valley Water Company in 1930.

- Following enactment of the Raker Act in 1913, the City was able to proceed with plans to develop its own water supply system. The construction of the Hetch Hetchy Project began in earnest in 1914, and after almost 20 years of construction, including the building of O'Shaughnessy Dam and a required transmission system, Sierra Nevada water began flowing into the local distribution system in 1934. The Hetch Hetchy Project is operated as a combined water storage and conveyance and electric generation and transmission system. The Water Enterprise and the Power Enterprise coordinate operation of the Hetch Hetchy Project to ensure reliable utility services are provided by the combined system. Pursuant to State statute, the Charter and the terms of the WSA, the SFPUC operates the Hetch Hetchy Project pursuant to a "water first" policy to optimize the reliability and quality of its water deliveries and ensure that hydroelectric generation does not cause any reasonably anticipated adverse impact on water service. Power is generated when water is delivered to meet water system operational requirements.

See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Water Rights and Related Proceedings."

Since the 1930s, the major additions to the SFPUC's water system have included the raising of O'Shaughnessy Dam at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir (1935-38), and the development of Lake Lloyd (Cherry) Reservoir, the construction of additional pipelines across the San Joaquin Valley, and the local construction of San Antonio Reservoir in Alameda County and the Bay Division Pipelines 2, 3 and 4. Other local projects included Crystal Springs Pipeline No. 3, Sunol Valley and San Andreas Filtration Plants, and the Crystal Springs Bypass Tunnel and Balancing Reservoir. The SFPUC has completed the majority of WSIP projects including the Irvington Tunnels 1 and 2, Bay Division Pipeline 5, and a new tunnel under San Francisco Bay between Newark in Alameda County and East Palo Alto in San Mateo County that replaced the transbay portion of Bay Division Pipelines 1 and 2.

The Regional Water System is geographically delineated between the Hetch Hetchy Project and the Bay Area water system facilities.

- The Hetch Hetchy Project is generally comprised of the reservoirs, hydroelectric generation and transmission facilities, and water transmission facilities from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir west to the Alameda East Portal of the Coast Range Tunnel in Sunol Valley.

- The Bay Area water system is generally comprised of the facilities west of Alameda East Portal and includes the Alameda and Peninsula watershed reservoirs, two water treatment plants and the conveyance system that delivers water to the SFPUC's Retail Customers and wholesale customers.

Water Conveyance and Distribution

Regional Water System. The Regional Water System comprises three regional water supply and conveyance systems: the Hetch Hetchy System; the Alameda System; and the Peninsula System (as herein defined).

Hetch Hetchy System. In the Hetch Hetchy System, water is diverted from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir into a series of tunnels and aqueducts from the Sierra Nevada to the San Joaquin Pipelines that cross the San Joaquin Valley to the Coast Range Tunnel (collectively, the "**Hetch Hetchy System**") which connects to the Alameda System at the Alameda East Portal. The Tesla Treatment Facility disinfects Hetch Hetchy Water. See "– Water Treatment – *Hetch Hetchy Water*."

Alameda System. The "Alameda System" includes two reservoirs, San Antonio Reservoir and Calaveras Reservoir, which collect water from the upper Alameda and San Antonio Creek watersheds in Alameda County, plus conveyance facilities connecting the Hetch Hetchy System and Alameda water sources to the Peninsula System. These conveyance facilities include pipelines known as the Alameda Siphons that connect the Coast Range Tunnel to Irvington Tunnels 1 and 2.

Irvington Tunnels 1 and 2 supply the five Bay Division Pipelines that cross the South Bay Area to the Peninsula System. Bay Division Pipelines 1, 2 and 5 connect with the Bay Tunnel on opposite sides of the San Francisco Bay near the Dumbarton Bridge. The Bay Tunnel itself runs beneath the floor of San Francisco Bay. Bay Division Pipelines 3 and 4 traverse the southerly edge of San Francisco Bay delivering water to SFPUC customers along the way. All five pipelines reconnect near the inlet to the Pulgas Tunnel on the Peninsula.

The Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant filters and disinfects water supplied from San Antonio and Calaveras Reservoirs, and, when necessary, water from the Sierra Nevada.

A turnout from the South Bay Aqueduct of the California State Water Project (the "**State Water Project**") could be refurbished and utilized to supply limited supplemental water to San Antonio Reservoir. However, the SFPUC currently possesses no entitlements to water from the State Water Project.

Peninsula System. Two reservoirs, Crystal Springs and San Andreas, collect runoff from the San Mateo Creek watershed. Water from Pilarcitos Reservoir, on Pilarcitos Creek, directly serves one of the Wholesale Customers, the Coastside County Water District (which includes the City of Half Moon Bay), and can also deliver water to Crystal Springs and San Andreas Reservoirs. Water delivered from the Bay Division Pipelines in excess of Peninsula System and in-City demands spills into Crystal Springs and San Andreas Reservoirs. The Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant filters and disinfects water supplied from Crystal Springs and San Andreas Reservoirs before it is delivered to Peninsula customers and the In-City Distribution System. The "Peninsula System" includes conveyance facilities connecting the Bay Division Pipelines to the In-City Distribution System and to other SFPUC customers on the Peninsula.

In-City Distribution System. The City's retail water supply is delivered to San Francisco in several major pipelines. Water to the east side of the In-City Distribution System is fed by two pipelines that terminate at University Mound. Water to the west side of the In-City Distribution System is fed by two pipelines that terminate at Sunset Reservoir and one that terminates at Merced Manor Reservoir. The In-City Distribution System to homes and businesses in San Francisco is comprised of 1,235 miles of pipeline.

Summary of System Facilities. The Regional Water System and the In-City Distribution System facilities are summarized below.

TABLE 12
SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FACILITIES

	Regional Water System	In-City Distribution System
Pipelines	389 miles	1,235 miles
Tunnels	74.5 miles	None
Pump Stations	5	25
Reservoirs and/or Water Tanks	11 reservoirs	11 reservoirs/8 water tanks
Groundwater Wells	13	6
Treatment Plants	3	None

Source: SFPUC.

Water Treatment

Hetch Hetchy Water. Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is the largest unfiltered water supply on the West Coast and one of only a few large unfiltered municipal water supplies in the nation. The water originates from spring snowmelt flowing down the Tuolumne River to Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, where it is stored.

This water source is located in the well protected Yosemite National Park and the High Sierra region. This area meets or exceeds all federal and State criteria for watershed protection. The water originating from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is protected in pipes and tunnels as it is conveyed to the Bay Area, and requires pH adjustment to control pipeline corrosion and disinfection for bacteria control. Based on the SFPUC's disinfection treatment practice, extensive bacteriological quality monitoring, and high operational standards, the USEPA and the State of California Department of Health Services have determined that the Hetch Hetchy water source meets federal and State drinking water quality requirements without filtration, and thus the SFPUC is not required to filter water from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. For further discussion of the State and federal regulatory requirements affecting the Water Enterprise, see "REGULATORY MATTERS."

The Tesla Treatment Facility, a key component of the WSIP, enhances high water quality through ultraviolet ("**UV**") treatment. The Tesla Treatment Facility was officially dedicated in 2011, following two years of construction. The facility uses UV light to disinfect Hetch Hetchy water to meet federal requirements to control the waterborne parasite *Cryptosporidium*, and is among the largest drinking-water UV disinfection facilities in North America. In the same location, a chlorine disinfection station was constructed to meet current fire and earthquake safety standards and replace the old station built in 1937. See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Water System Improvement Program."

Local Water. All water derived from surface water sources other than Hetch Hetchy Reservoir requires filtration and is currently treated at one of two treatment plants: the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant ("**Sunol Valley WTP**") and the Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant ("**Harry Tracy WTP**"). Major upgrades of these two facilities have been completed as part of the WSIP. See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Water System Improvement Program." New groundwater supply from the San Francisco Groundwater Supply Project does not require filtration. Treatment of groundwater for hexavalent chromium (Chrome-6), nitrate, manganese and other constituents to meet federal and State drinking water regulations will be achieved through blending. Blending treatment is currently taking place within distribution pipelines at Sunset Reservoir.

Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant. The Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant treats all water from the two reservoirs in the Alameda System, Calaveras and San Antonio. Sunol Valley WTP has a capacity of 160 mgd. Treatment processes at Sunol Valley WTP include coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, filtration, and disinfection. Fluoridation, chloramination and corrosion control treatment are provided for the combined Hetch Hetchy Project and Sunol Valley WTP water at the chloramination and fluoridation facilities in Sunol. Sunol Valley WTP also filters Hetch Hetchy water on the occasions when the Sierra supply does not meet required drinking water standards.

The Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Expansion and Treated Water Reservoir Project added a fifth sedimentation basin to increase reliable capacity, retrofitted existing filters, and created a 17.5-million-gallon circular treated water reservoir as it leaves the plant. The project included other new connections and facilities that enable the plant to treat enough water to meet basic customer demands alone for up to 60 days after a major earthquake in conjunction with other facilities. These improvements help increase delivery reliability and water quality.

Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant. The Harry Tracy WTP primarily treats water from the Peninsula System reservoirs and has a peak capacity of 140 mgd and a sustainable capacity of 120 mgd. Treatment processes at the Harry Tracy WTP include ozonation, coagulation, flocculation, filtration, disinfection, fluoridation, corrosion control treatment and chloramination.

Updates to the Harry Tracy WTP included the addition of filters, upgrades to various systems, construction of a new treated water reservoir, and seismic retrofits of critical process units. As a result of the upgrades, the Harry Tracy WTP has improved its delivery reliability and can now achieve a sustained capacity of 140 mgd for at least 60 days and provide 140 mgd within 24 hours following a seismic event on the San Andreas Fault.

Water Storage

Up-Country Storage. The majority of the water delivered by the SFPUC is supplied by runoff from the Upper Tuolumne River watershed on the western slope of the central Sierra Nevada. Three major reservoirs collect runoff: Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, Lake Lloyd (Cherry) Reservoir and Lake Eleanor Reservoir.

Water stored in Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is also used for hydroelectric generation and released downstream to satisfy instream flow requirements. Normally, only Hetch Hetchy Reservoir supplies water exported to the Bay Area for municipal and industrial uses. Releases from Lake Eleanor Reservoir and Lake Lloyd (Cherry) Reservoir are used to satisfy instream flow requirements, satisfy the Irrigation Districts' Raker Act entitlements and produce hydroelectric power.

Downstream of the Hetch Hetchy System on the Tuolumne River is the Don Pedro Project, owned and operated by the Irrigation Districts. The Don Pedro Project includes a dam that impounds the Tuolumne River, creating the New Don Pedro Reservoir, also owned by the Irrigation Districts. The City helped fund the original construction of the Don Pedro Project in exchange for eliminating the City's flood control responsibility and establishing a water bank account (the "**Water Bank**") allowing the SFPUC to receive water credits for advanced releases from the Hetch Hetchy Project to the New Don Pedro Reservoir to meet the Irrigation Districts' downstream requirements. Water Bank storage space in New Don Pedro Reservoir is integrated into the Water System's operations.

Certain water stored in New Don Pedro Reservoir is credited to the City's Water Bank, which allows the City to meet its Raker Act water obligations to the Irrigation Districts and divert water supply from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir to the Bay Area.

Local Storage. On the San Francisco Peninsula, the SFPUC uses Crystal Springs Reservoir, San Andreas Reservoir and Pilarcitos Reservoir located in San Mateo County to capture local watershed runoff. In the Alameda Creek watershed (Alameda County), the SFPUC manages Calaveras Reservoir and San Antonio Reservoir. In addition to using these facilities to capture runoff, the San Andreas, San Antonio and Crystal Springs Reservoirs also provide storage for Hetch Hetchy Project diversions, and, along with Calaveras Reservoir and Pilarcitos Reservoir, serve as water supply delivery facilities in the event of an interruption to Hetch Hetchy Project deliveries.

Dam Supervision. Eighteen dams under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC are presently licensed and regulated by the California Department of Water Resources' Division of Safety of Dams ("**DSOD**"). The SFPUC's Calaveras Dam Replacement Project was completed in 2019. See "REGULATORY MATTERS – Dam Licensing and Safety Issues."

System Storage Capacity. The following table summarizes the storage and capacity of the Regional Water System reservoirs within the Water Enterprise as of May 19, 2025.

TABLE 13
REGIONAL WATER SYSTEM STORAGE AND CAPACITY
(AS OF MAY 19, 2025)

	Current Storage[(1)(2)(3)] (Acre-Feet)	Maximum Storage[(4)] (Acre-Feet)	Available Capacity (Acre-Feet)	Percent of Maximum Storage[(5)]
Tuolumne Storage				
Hetch Hetchy Reservoir	328,300	360,360	32,060	91.1%
Cherry Reservoir	264,700	273,345	8,645	96.8
Lake Eleanor Reservoir	24,790	27,100	2,310	91.5
Water Bank	570,000	570,000	0	100.0
Total Tuolumne Storage:	1,187,790	1,230,805	43,015	96.5%
Local Storage				
Calaveras Reservoir	76,859	96,670	19,811	79.5%
San Antonio Reservoir	46,176	53,266	7,090	86.7
Crystal Springs Reservoir	45,374	68,953	23,579	65.8
San Andreas Reservoir	15,674	18,675	3,001	83.9
Pilarcitos Reservoir	1,962	3,125	1,163	62.8
Total Local Storage:	186,045	240,689	54,644	77.3%
Total Regional Water System	1,373,835	1,471,494	97,659	93.4%

(1) Upcountry storage is the date's 8:00 a.m. storage value taken from United States Geological Survey data.
(2) Water Bank storage reported by Hetch Hetchy Water and Power for May 18, 2025.
(3) Local storage is the date's 8:00 a.m. storage value taken from United States Geological Survey data.
(4) Hetch Hetchy maximum storage is with drum gates activated. Cherry and Eleanor maximum storage is with flashboards in. All maximum storages taken from rating curve.
(5) The ratio of median storage for this day over maximum storage capacity. Median storage for this day is based on historical storage data from years 1991-2020.

Source: SFPUC.

Table 13 shows storage levels as of May 19, 2025. Total Regional Water System storage levels would normally be at approximately 83.4% of Total Regional Water System storage capacity as of this date. The level as of May 19, 2025, is higher than that at approximately 93.4% of Total Regional Water System storage capacity. The Water Bank is at 100.0% of total capacity as of May 18, 2025. Tuolumne storage is operated to receive snowmelt runoff, which has been at around normal level for Water Year 2025, while local storage relies primarily on Bay Area rainfall, which has been at around normal level for Water Year 2025. Both Tuolumne storage and local storage are close to full at 96.5% and 77.3%, respectively. See "WATER FACILITIES – Water Storage – *System Storage Capacity*." Maximum storage is subject to regulation by the DSOD.

In-City Storage. The Water Enterprise's in-City reservoirs and storage tanks have the capacity to hold approximately 421.9 million gallons, or 1,295 acre-feet. The SFPUC estimates this capacity to be an approximate five-day supply at the current average rate of consumption for San Francisco. In-City reservoirs that are also terminal reservoirs for the Regional Water System moderate flow peaking for the Regional Water System, and water stored in them can be conveyed back to the San Francisco Peninsula.

The following table summarizes the storage capacity of the in-City reservoirs and storage tanks maintained by the Water Enterprise.

TABLE 14
IN-CITY DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM
POTABLE WATER STORAGE CAPACITY

Reservoir	Millions of Gallons
Sunset[(1)]	176.7
University Mound[(1)]	140.9
Sutro	31.4
Summit	14.0
College Hill	13.5
Stanford Heights	12.9
Merced Manor[(1)]	9.5
Lombard	6.2
Potrero	1.3
Hunters Point	1.1
Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Tanks	4.2
Storage Tanks	10.2
Total	421.9

(1) Terminal reservoirs for the Regional Water System.
Source: SFPUC.

In addition, there is an emergency supply of existing non-potable water immediately available within San Francisco at Lake Merced. Lake Merced currently holds approximately 1.5 billion gallons or approximately 4,603 acre-feet.

Physical Condition of Certain Facilities

Certain of the Water Enterprise's facilities have been in service for considerable amounts of time. Long lived facilities may experience decreased reliability due to unplanned outages and place a greater maintenance burden on SFPUC operations. In addition, the vulnerabilities of the Regional Water System are increased by its limited redundancy. Outages at critical points could disrupt delivery to large portions of the Regional Water System. See "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations."

Built between 1917 and 1925, Mountain Tunnel extends 18.9 miles from the Early Intake Dam to Priest Reservoir. The upper 7.4 miles are not lined, and the lower 11.5 miles are lined. Inspections in 1989, 2006, 2008 and 2017 identified signs of deterioration in the lining which were projected to increase over time. The risk of failure of Mountain Tunnel, defined as a loss of 25% carrying capacity, is currently low but, left unaddressed, will increase over time. Failure of Mountain Tunnel would have a significant impact on the Hetch Hetchy water system ("**Hetch Hetchy Water**") operations and could cause up to six or more months of water supply disruption. The SFPUC is taking action to address the risk of Mountain Tunnel failure (see "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – *Hetch Hetchy Water – Mountain Tunnel*").

The Coast Range Tunnel is a 26-mile long tunnel running from Tesla Portal to the Alameda East Portal and was put into operation in 1934. The Coast Range Tunnel was most recently inspected in January 2015 after having been last inspected in 1995. The most recent inspection revealed that the Coast Range Tunnel is still in good condition, with little change noted since the 1995 inspection. The next condition assessment of the Coast Range Tunnel is expected in 2033-2035. Irvington Tunnel 1 was also inspected in winter 2015 and was also found to be in good condition.

The WSIP was designed in part to reduce vulnerability of the Regional Water System and increase reliability of the system to deliver water by improving seismic reliability and redundancy needed to accommodate planned outages for maintenance and unplanned outages resulting from facility failure. The WSIP was not designed to replace

or upgrade the entire water system. Repair of Mountain Tunnel and other Hetch Hetchy water transmission facilities, as well as the replacement, rehabilitation and repair of water transmission and distribution pipelines and other Regional Water System and in-City facilities are included in the SFPUC's 2026 Capital Plan (as defined herein). See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES."

Prior Heavy Storms

Storms can damage the facilities of the Water Enterprise. Early winter storms at the end of 2022 and beginning of 2023, for example, caused damage to several Water Enterprise facilities. These storms did not, however, significantly impact the operation of the Regional Water System. The SFPUC continued to deliver high-quality drinking water to its retail and wholesale customers throughout the storm events. Watershed roads in Alameda and San Mateo Counties experienced erosion, sinkholes and slides and repairs are needed to restore access. At the Alameda Creek Diversion Dam, fast-rising creek flows damaged fish screens and gates, and debris washed into the concrete diversion structure. There was also superficial erosion on the downstream face of Calaveras Dam that required repair. The Hetch Hetchy Water and Power upcountry facilities faced complete and partial road failures; however, Hetch Hetchy crews managed to maintain access to critical facilities during the storms. Additional reported damages include erosion near the headgate structure of the Early Intake Dam.

The SFPUC anticipates that both short- and long-term capital projects will be necessary to rebuild roads and repair damaged facilities. The total estimated cost of damages is expected to be at approximately $70 million; however, final costs will not be known until at least fall 2025. The SFPUC expects to cover these costs through reserves, revenues from the Water Enterprise and Power Enterprise, and proceeds from existing Water and Power Enterprise bonds. The City has applied for federal and State disaster relief funding, and the SFPUC plans to seek reimbursement for qualified expenses.

Seismic Hazards

The Hetch Hetchy Project is located largely in Yosemite National Park, one of the most stable seismic zones in the State, and there are no known major faults in the area. The Water Enterprise's distribution and transmission systems and its customers are, however, located in seismically active regions of the State. The San Andreas Fault lies immediately west of San Francisco, and the Hayward Fault is approximately 15 miles to the east. A third major fault, the Calaveras Fault, is a branch of the Hayward Fault and lies east of the Hayward Fault.

During the past 150 years, the San Francisco Bay Area has experienced several major and numerous minor earthquakes. The largest was the 1906 San Francisco earthquake along the San Andreas Fault with an estimated magnitude of 8.2 on the Richter scale. The 1868 Hayward earthquake along the Hayward Fault had an estimated magnitude of between 6.8 and 7.0 on the Richter scale. The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake along the San Andreas Fault had an estimated magnitude of 6.9 on the Richter scale. The 2014 South Napa earthquake on the West Napa Fault, the northern extension of the Calaveras Fault, had a magnitude of 6.0 on the Richter scale and an epicenter near the City of Napa, approximately 50 miles north of San Francisco. The most recent significant earthquake was the 7.0-magnitude 2024 Offshore Cape Mendocino California earthquake, which erupted approximately 40 miles offshore from Petrolia in Humbolt County, along the Mendocino Fault, which sits in an area where three tectonic plates coverage (the Mendocino Triple Junction), one of the most seismically active parts of California.

The Regional Water System crosses several active and potentially active faults, including major strike-slip faults within the San Francisco Bay region. Major fault crossings along the pipeline delivery system include the Orestimba fault at Tesla Portal, the Greenville fault in the Coast Range Tunnel, the Calaveras fault at the Alameda Siphons, and the southern Hayward Fault at the Bay Division Pipelines numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. In addition, other lower slip rate but potentially active faults cross the water system. These faults potentially move by secondary or triggered slip during large earthquakes on the San Andreas fault. Furthermore, three main transmission pipelines from Harry Tracy WTP – San Andreas Pipeline No. 2, San Andreas Pipeline No. 3 and Sunset Supply Branch Pipeline – cross the Serra fault, a secondary fault located along the peninsula in San Mateo County.

According to the United States Geological Survey, the Greenville, Calaveras, Hayward and San Andreas Faults have a high likelihood of producing a major (magnitude $\geq$ 6.7) earthquake in the San Francisco Bay region before 2043 (during the period the 2025DEF Bonds will be outstanding). A large earthquake on these faults has the

potential for generating surface fault rupture that is hazardous to specific SFPUC facilities. A major goal of the nearly-completed WSIP is to rehabilitate and strengthen the tunnels, pipelines and other Water Enterprise facilities that cross or are situated near known active faults. The WSIP included 27 projects that had seismic reliability as a primary or secondary goal; all of these projects have been completed with the most recent completion of the Calaveras Dam Replacement project in 2019.

If a major seismic event or other emergency occurs, the SFPUC is authorized under the WSA to adopt emergency rate surcharges outside of the normal budget development process. Such rate surcharges will be applicable to both Retail Customers and wholesale customers and incorporate the same percentage increase for all customers. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue." Any emergency rate surcharge adopted by the SFPUC will remain in effect only until the next budget-coordinated rate-setting cycle, at which time it can be reviewed for continuance and modification.

If a significant earthquake occurs that affects the Water Enterprise's tunnels, pipelines or other facilities, the SFPUC would attempt to repair any damage as quickly as possible, and the amount of time required to return the facilities to service would depend on the nature and extent of damage incurred. A prolonged reduction in the Water Enterprise's water supply resulting from a major earthquake could have a material adverse effect on Revenues.

With the completion of the WSIP's seismic improvement projects, the performance objective for the system is to deliver basic service (average winter month demand) to at least 70 percent of customer turnouts within each of three regions within 24 hours of a major seismic event. For additional reliability, the SFPUC has established intertie connections with the East Bay Municipal Utility District and the Santa Clara Valley Water District to diversify water supply options in case of a major seismic event. Should the Irvington Tunnels or the five major pipelines branching from the Irvington Tunnels become inoperable, the SFPUC would attempt to negotiate additional water sharing agreements with these and other regional water utilities that interconnect with Water Enterprise facilities, but there is no assurance that such negotiations would be successful.

If damage to the Irvington Tunnels or the pipelines that connect to the tunnels resulted in the loss of water transported through the tunnel, the remaining water supply would be limited to storage in three raw water reservoirs in San Mateo County (the Crystal Springs, San Andreas and Pilarcitos Reservoirs); treated water in transmission storage reservoirs, tunnels, and pipelines; and three terminal reservoirs located in San Francisco. Additional supply may be available from existing intertie connections and Regional and San Francisco groundwater wells. The combined capacity of the three San Mateo County raw water reservoirs is approximately 29.8 billion gallons. The SFPUC has historically kept these reservoirs filled to a combined capacity of approximately 18 billion gallons, or an estimated two- and one-half month water supply based on historical average daily water demand of both the Retail Customers and wholesale customers. It is anticipated that in-city storage alone would last approximately four to seven days.

Separate from the SFPUC system, individual wholesale customers have storage ranging from zero to seven days.

System Level of Service Criteria after Seismic Events. The SFPUC has established basic "Level of Service" criteria for the design of new facilities and upgrade of existing facilities, including projects within the WSIP to deliver winter day demand of 229 mgd (projected February 2030 demand) within 24 hours after a major earthquake. This embodies the following primary criteria and assumptions to be used in examining system reliability with system retrofit projects in place:

- Deliver winter day demand to at least 70% of the wholesale customers' turnouts within each of the three customer groups (Santa Clara/Alameda/South San Mateo County, Northern San Mateo County, and City of San Francisco).

- Achieve a 90% confidence level of meeting the above goal, given the occurrence of a major earthquake. The earthquakes considered are treated independently and with equal weighting, without regard to their return period.

- To achieve the basic level of service, the SFPUC will rely on the wholesale customers' own water systems and other regional water purveyors' systems. The SFPUC will work with the wholesale customers to assess their ability to contribute to their own system reliability.

- The SFPUC will consider a facility to have failed if it cannot be brought back to its intended purpose within twenty-four hours without secondary damage resulting.

- To achieve the basic level of service, the SFPUC will assume that power supplies are available, whether from the grid or from standby sources.

No particular item in the Regional Water System is required to be seismically upgraded or retrofitted as long as the system-wide performance goals established by the SFPUC can be satisfied. Earthquake damage to selected components and systems is acceptable, as long as the system-wide performance remains acceptable.

Wildfire Considerations

Facilities of the Water Enterprise include 107 miles of overhead electrical lines that are located within the California Public Utilities Commission's designated High Fire Threat District. The lines are primarily located in the Sierra Nevada, surrounding foothills, and on the Peninsula. The Peninsula watershed is located within the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CALFIRE) "High" Fire Hazard Severity Zone, primarily because of its proximity to residential areas.

Wildfires can disrupt the operation of, or cause damage to, facilities used to convey the SFPUC's water supply, e.g., hydro-generation, power and water transmission, and other operational buildings. Wildfires can also significantly impact vegetation and soils which can adversely impact water quality within the SFPUC's water supply and regulating reservoirs. The Rim Fire, a wildfire in 2013, substantially burned the forest around the Holm and Kirkwood Powerhouses and reached the edges of all three Sierra Nevada reservoirs. Though the Rim Fire, by consuming potential fuel, has reduced some near-term risk of wildfire in the region, the SFPUC's Water Enterprise still owns many miles of overhead electrical lines through highly forested areas.

The SFPUC maintains a Wildfire Mitigation Plan (the "**Mitigation Plan**") which describes the numerous programs that the SFPUC has in place to construct, maintain and operate its electrical facilities in order to minimize the risk that its equipment could be the origin or contributing source for a catastrophic wildfire. The Mitigation Plan meets or exceeds the requirements of Section 8387 of the California Public Utilities Code for publicly owned electric utilities. As required, the Mitigation Plan is reviewed by an independent evaluator, approved by the SFPUC Commission, and submitted to the California Wildfire Safety Advisory Board on or before July 1, of each year.

In addition, the SFPUC owns and manages approximately 61,000 acres of watershed lands in the Bay Area that are managed in part to prevent and minimize wildfire risks. In August 2020, rare, major thunderstorm activity in the Bay Area caused numerous fires around the Bay Area and in the SFPUC's watersheds. The Peninsula lightning strikes started approximately 12 small fires which were quickly extinguished. Major wildfires also erupted in the East Bay watersheds, referred to as the SCU Lightning Complex Fires. The SCU Lightning Complex Fires burned roughly 10,000 acres out of 38,000 acres of land that the SFPUC owns in the East Bay. The SFPUC does not own all of the land in the Calaveras Reservoir watershed; however, approximately two-thirds of the Calaveras Reservoir watershed burned. The SFPUC is working to repair watershed fences damaged in the SCU Lightning Complex Fires.

See also "RISK FACTORS – Risks Relating to Financial Operations – *Inverse Condemnation*."

Emergency Firefighting Water System

In response to the 1906 earthquake and fire that ravaged San Francisco, the City constructed multiple systems to fight fires in the event of an emergency. These multiple systems and sources of water supply provide layers of fire protection to residences and businesses across San Francisco.

The first system is a standard-pressure municipal drinking water system connected to approximately 8,552 standard white fire hydrants, which are located on every block throughout the city and regularly used by the San Francisco Fire Department to fight fires. These fire hydrants are fed by 12 reservoirs and six tanks in San Francisco, which are ultimately supplied by the SFPUC reservoirs on the Peninsula, East Bay, and Sierra Nevada.

The second system is the high-pressure Emergency Firefighting Water System connected to approximately 1,335 larger hydrants. The Emergency Firefighting Water System, also known as the Auxiliary Water Supply System, has been constructed over the decades following the 1906 earthquake. The EFWS is an entirely separate water supply and pipeline network for fighting large fires, particularly after emergency events such as earthquakes. The system consists of a resilient 135-mile pipeline network, a high elevation reservoir, two large capacity tanks, two seawater pumping stations, and numerous other bay water intakes (suction connections). The system has unique capabilities, including the ability to deliver water at the high pressures needed by the San Francisco Fire Department to fight large fires, and the ability to use water from the San Francisco Bay as an unlimited source for firefighting.

In 2010, the SFPUC assumed management of the EFWS and began working with the San Francisco Fire Department and San Francisco Public Works to upgrade the system. Since then, the SFPUC has installed 30 new stand-alone cisterns (buried 70,000 gallon tanks), 15 of which are located in westside neighborhoods in San Francisco, to provide additional sources of water for firefighting. San Francisco has approximately 200 cisterns across the city. The SFPUC has also made upgrades and repairs to existing pump stations and reservoirs and constructed new pipelines, including one in the Candlestick Point/Carroll Avenue area.

The EFWS is now being expanded to the Richmond and Sunset Districts in the west side of San Francisco with a new version of piping called the Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System, which will be used for transmission of potable water in normal times but will be isolated for firefighting uses after large earthquakes. The Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System project, estimated to cost approximately $145 million, $54.2 million of which is included in the SFPUC's 2026 Capital Plan. The pipelines will be financed with a combination of the SFPUC's water revenue bonds and City general obligation bond funds. The initial segment of the Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System was constructed in 2023 and the next major construction contracts is expected to begin in 2026. Future construction of this system will continue in segments pending additional funding from the SFPUC's water revenue bonds and City general obligation bond funds.

Safety and Security

The safety of the facilities of the Water Enterprise is maintained via a combination of regular inspections by SFPUC employees, electronic monitoring, and analysis of unusual incident reports. Most above-ground facilities operated and maintained by the SFPUC are controlled-access facilities with fencing, gates, closed circuit television systems and security officers at certain points. Smaller, above-ground and subterranean pumping stations operated and maintained by the SFPUC are locked with padlock or internal locking mechanisms, and most are monitored via access/intrusion alarms. Security improvements are evaluated on an ongoing basis. The electronic operations and controls have been evaluated and designed to reduce exposure using a series of technology systems enhancements and integration.

The operation of Water Enterprise facilities is also subject to the risk of cyberattack. The SFPUC abides by the City's Citywide Cyber Security Policy and also maintains its own cybersecurity program. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Cybersecurity" and "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operation – *Cybersecurity*."

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES

Capital and Financial Planning Process

The SFPUC's long-term capital and financial planning is performed on an annual rolling 10-year forward looking basis. The SFPUC prepares a 10-year capital plan for each of its enterprises, as required by the Charter. The 10-year capital plan serves as the basis for the development of the annual 10-year financial plan. Proposed long-term capital programs, projects and investments, and related costs are included in the 10-year financial plan. Consistent

with the Charter, updates to the 10-year capital plan and 10-year financial plan are generally reviewed at least annually and adopted by the Commission each February. The 10-year financial plan provides estimated rate impacts of projected capital and operating spending and assures compliance with the SFPUC's adopted financial policies, including its debt service coverage and fund balance reserve policy requirements.

The 10-year capital plan is not a budget and is not "appropriated" like a budget. The annual capital programs can be revised during the development of the budget and final projects, costs and totals for specific capital improvements to be financed can change. Consequently, even though the annual budgets passed are based on the 10-year capital plan, they may occasionally differ from it.

The Water Enterprise's 10-year capital plan for Fiscal Years 2025-26 to 2034-35, which includes the Water Enterprise-related components of the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power 10-year capital plan, adopted by the Commission on February 11, 2025 (the "**2026 Capital Plan**"), totals approximately $3.044 billion. The 2026 Capital Plan includes projects in three major Water Enterprise categories: (i) Regional Water; (ii) Local Water; and (iii) Hetch Hetchy Water. The Regional Water, Local Water and Hetch Hetchy Water categories of the Water Enterprise's 2026 Capital Plan are expected to be financed by a combination of revenue bonds, commercial paper, revolving notes, Parity State Loans, revenues (pay-as-you-go) and capacity charges. For more information regarding the 2026 Capital Plan programs, see "– Regional Water Program," "– Local Water Program," and "– Hetch Hetchy Water" below. See also "FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS."

The following table sets forth the first five years of the Water Enterprise's capital improvement program as set forth in the 2026 Capital Plan.

TABLE 15
WATER ENTERPRISE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30[(1)]
(IN THOUSANDS)

	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	Total
Regional Water	$139,808	$292,595	$248,638	$199,537	$115,035	$ 995,613
Local Water	337,375	251,731	90,810	70,985	64,811	815,712
Hetch Hetchy Water	85,222	72,477	79,514	41,089	76,292	354,594
Total Appropriations[(2)]	$562,405	$616,803	$418,962	$311,611	$256,138	$2,165,919

(1) Amounts are based on anticipated appropriations and are projections from the Water Enterprise 2026 Capital Plan. Actual results may differ materially from these projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS."
(2) Totals may not add due to rounding.
Source: SFPUC.

Regional Water Program

The Regional Water Program, projected to comprise approximately $1.260 billion of the 2026 Capital Plan, finances capital improvements to the Regional Water System. Regional Water Program capital investments include, but are not limited to, water treatment, water transmission, water supply and storage, watersheds and land management, communication and monitoring, and building and grounds management.

The Regional Water category of the 2026 Capital Plan also includes approximately $60.2 million in funding for project planning related to certain regional projects in the AWS Program, as well as for additional planning efforts for other alternative water supply options. For more information regarding the AWS Program, see "– Water Supply Initiatives – *AWS Program*."

Local Water Program

The Local Water Program, projected to comprise approximately $1.158 billion of the 2026 Capital Plan, finances capital improvements to the In-City Distribution System. The primary component of the Local Water Program, projected to comprise approximately $755 million, is the local Water Conveyance and Distribution program,

which consists of pipeline installation, repair and replacement. For pipeline replacement, the SFPUC has replaced an average of 7.8 miles of pipe annually over the past five years compared to a previous rate of four to six miles per year. The SFPUC has increased its planned investment in the 2026 Capital Plan in order to increase the pipeline replacement rate to approximately 12 miles per year.

The Local Water category of the 2026 Capital Plan also includes planning efforts to advance conservation and develop local water supply sources. For more information about these local water supply initiatives, see "– Water Supply Initiatives – *Local Water Supply Initiatives.*"

Hetch Hetchy Water

General. Upgrades to the aging facilities of Hetch Hetchy Water and Power are being constructed to ensure reliability and preparedness for the future. The Hetch Hetchy Water category of the 2026 Capital Plan is projected to cost approximately $625.8 million. Upcountry water and power facilities being assessed and rehabilitated, where needed, include three impounding reservoirs, three regulating reservoirs, three large powerhouses, one small powerhouse, two switchyards, three substations, 170 miles of pipeline and tunnels, almost 100 miles of paved road, over 160 miles of transmission lines, as well as watershed land and rights-of-way property. The Water Enterprise will fund all assets relating to Hetch Hetchy Water (consisting of approximately $187.8 million of Hetch Hetchy Water costs) and the Hetch Hetchy Water portion of jointly-owned assets of Hetch Hetchy Water and the Power Enterprise in the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power System (consisting of approximately $438.0 million of Hetch Hetchy Water costs). See "THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION – Organization, Purposes and Powers – *Hetch Hetchy – Water and Power Operations*." A significant project among the Hetch Hetchy Water category is the repair of the existing Mountain Tunnel which conveys all Tuolumne River supplies through a single conduit. See "– *Mountain Tunnel*."

Mountain Tunnel. As part of the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System, Mountain Tunnel is a critical water conveyance facility. Built between 1917 and 1925, Mountain Tunnel extends 18.9 miles from the Early Intake Dam to Priest Reservoir. The upper 7.9 miles are unlined (natural rock) and the lower 11.0 miles are lined with concrete. Inspections in 1989, 2006, 2008 and 2017 identified signs of deterioration in the lining which were projected to increase over time. The risk of failure of Mountain Tunnel, defined as a loss of 25% carrying capacity, is currently low but will increase over time. Failure of Mountain Tunnel would have a significant impact on Hetch Hetchy Water operations and could cause up to six months of water supply disruption.

The SFPUC created four parallel tracks to investigate and provide repairs to Mountain Tunnel: (1) the Mountain Tunnel Inspection and Interim Repairs Project, completed in 2017, (2) the Mountain Tunnel Adits and Access Improvement Project, also completed in 2017, (3) 2018 Mountain Tunnel Interim Repairs Project, which was completed in 2019, and (4) the Mountain Tunnel Improvements Project, currently in construction. A complete shutdown and draining of Mountain Tunnel was performed during 2017 to accomplish the Inspection and Interim Repairs Project and the Adits and Access Improvement Project, as well as to develop information and knowledge for the design and construction of the Long-Term Improvements Project. Additional interim repairs were performed in 2019 to complete the most significant repairs needed to reduce the risk of failures in the concrete lining. The Mountain Tunnel Improvements Project, currently in construction, provides long term rehabilitation and repairs to the tunnel as well as the addition of flow controls (valving) and knife gate valves on the downstream end of the tunnel near Priest Reservoir. The flow controls will allow the tunnel to be operated in a full state at different flow rates which will reduce lining deterioration and allow for operational flexibility for hydroelectric power generation. The knife gate valves allow for work and inspections inside the tunnel without the need to lower the water elevation of Priest Reservoir. The Mountain Tunnel Improvements construction contract was awarded in October 2020, with Notice to Proceed in January 2021. Significant project work has been completed to date including construction of a large diameter shaft, installation of two of the four knife gate valves, as part of the flow control facility near Priest Reservoir, construction of new access adit tunnel near Priest Reservoir, partial repair of tunnel interior lining, access road improvements, and various improvements along the tunnel alignment. The current construction contract is forecast to achieve substantial completion at the end of 2026. However, some scope of work related to the tunnel and roadway improvements at the South Fork site has been removed from the current contract due to differences of opinion about constructability with the current contractor. The City is evaluating alternative delivery procurement methods to complete the remaining work under a future contract. While the majority of the tunnel improvements will be completed, delaying this work will delay the full use of the flow control facility until these repairs at South Fork can be completed.

Improvements to Mountain Tunnel are projected to cost a total of approximately $268.7 million; $210.1 million has been appropriated to the project to date, and an additional $21.4 million will be appropriated for the 2026 Capital Plan. The portion of the project that performs repairs and improvements to the Mountain Tunnel is projected to cost $134.3 million; the tunnel has been classified as a Water asset and thus these costs will be funded 100% by Water Enterprise. The remaining portion of the project that constructs the new flow control facility is projected to cost $134.3 million; because this flow control facility will benefit both water delivery and power production, it has been classified as a joint asset, and thus will be funded by Water Enterprise and Power Enterprise, pursuant to existing cost-sharing agreements with wholesale customers. The current cost sharing agreement allocates 45% of the cost for joint assets to the Water Enterprise and 55% of the cost to the Power Enterprise. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – General – *Allocation of Hetch Hetchy Project Costs*."

The SFPUC has entered into the DWSRF Loan for up to $239.219 million with the SWRCB to finance a portion of the cost of the Mountain Tunnel Project pursuant to the SWRCB's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program. For more information regarding the loan, see "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans."

Water System Improvement Program

General. The Water System Improvement Program is a $4.793 billion program that consists of 87 capital projects to repair, replace and upgrade critical portions of the Regional Water System and the Local Water System to meet specific level of service goals and objectives for seismic reliability, delivery reliability, water quality and water supply in an environmentally sustainable and cost-effective manner. Objectives for WSIP include (i) furnishing system improvements to provide high quality water that reliably meets current and foreseeable local, State and federal requirements; (ii) reducing vulnerability of the water system to damage from earthquakes; (iii) increasing reliability of the system to deliver water by improving redundancy needed to accommodate planned outages for maintenance and unplanned outages resulting from facility failure; (iv) providing near-term improvement of water supply/drought protection; (v) setting forth long-term water supply/drought management options for technical evaluation, cost analysis and environmental review; (vi) enhancing sustainability through improvements that optimize protection of the natural and human environment; and (vii) providing improvements resulting in a cost-effective, fully-operational water system. As of December 2024, only two WSIP projects remain to be completed: (i) the Regional Groundwater Storage and Recovery Project, and (ii) the Alameda Creek Recapture Project. Both projects are currently in the construction phase and are further described below.

Schedule and Budget. In 2005, the SFPUC approved the original scope, schedule and a budget of $4.342 billion for WSIP (the "**2005 Baseline Budget**"). Since then, the SFPUC has approved several revisions to the schedule and budget for WSIP, most recently in April 2024 (the "**2024 Budget**"). The variance between the 2005 Baseline Budget and the 2024 Budget of $4.793 billion is an increase of approximately $446 million, or a 10.3% increase and is due mainly to construction cost increases to the WSIP's largest project, the Calaveras Dam Replacement Project (which increased by approximately $308 million, or 118% of total project cost). All appropriations for the WSIP have been made and WSIP is consequently not included in the 2026 Capital Plan (as defined herein). Pursuant to the 2024 Budget, the SFPUC anticipates overall program completion in June 2032.

Regional Groundwater Storage and Recovery Project. The Regional Groundwater Storage and Recovery Project has been divided into two phases. The Phase 1 construction contract, which includes the construction of up to 16 new groundwater recovery wells and test wells, chemical treatment equipment, pumping systems and pipelines, and other associated facilities, was completed in September 2022 and closed out in January 2023. Phase 2 has been divided into two construction contracts (Phases 2A and 2B); Phase 2 will provide improvements to the wells installed under Phase 1 to provide corrosion protection and other operational improvements, as well as to complete installation and connection of the South San Francisco Main Well. The Phase 2A contract to install cathodic protection and other improvements to some of the wells started construction in June 2022 and is anticipated to be completed later in 2025. The Phase 2B contract for installation of the South San Francisco Main Well facility and pipeline started construction in 2024 and is anticipated to be completed in 2026.

Alameda Creek Recapture Project. The Alameda Creek Recapture Project includes construction of facilities in and around an existing quarry pit in Sunol Valley to recapture water that will be released from Calaveras Reservoir and/or bypassed around the Alameda Creek Diversion Dam during future operations of Calaveras Reservoir.

Construction of the facility started in June 2021. In April 2023, the SFPUC terminated the project's construction contract due to concerns regarding worsening pond slope erosion, anticipated facility operating and maintenance complexity, and excessive change orders to redesign the facility to accommodate the erosive slope conditions. The project is being re-evaluated for short-term and long-term slope stability remediation and to consider improvements for operation and maintenance sustainability. The SFPUC will work with the quarry operator to stabilize the pond banks and re-evaluate the facility design to simplify operation and maintenance requirements. It is anticipated that a new construction contract will be issued using a design/build project delivery method and explore the possibility of adding initial operation and maintenance scope as part of the contract. The project is anticipated to be completed in 2032.

Water Supply Initiatives

AWS Program

General. With WSIP nearing completion, there are two main drivers for the SFPUC's future infrastructure water needs: (i) environmental flow requirements on the Tuolumne River that could result in a reduction of available water supplies by approximately 105 mgd during dry years at the current contract levels of demand if the 2018 Plan Amendment (as defined herein) requiring the release of 40% of unimpaired flow in the Tuolumne River is implemented (see "REGULATORY MATTERS – Bay Delta Water Quality Standards"); and (ii) a policy decision before the SFPUC on whether to provide a permanent supply guarantee of 9 mgd to the cities of San José and Santa Clara, who are currently interruptible customers (see "– Wholesale Deliveries – *Status of San José and Santa Clara*" and "– *2028 Water Supply Decisions*"). Both drivers may cause additional dry-year shortages. In 2019, with the goal of ensuring that the water needs of Retail and Wholesale Customers will continue to be met under future conditions, the SFPUC established the AWS Program to evaluate new and diverse alternative water supply options, such as expanding storage, groundwater banking, transfers, purified water (potable reuse), desalination and technological innovations.

Planning for alternative water supplies requires a comprehensive and detailed evaluation effort that considers several interrelated challenges, many of which are different than those faced through traditional water supply planning at the SFPUC. These planning challenges include complex multi-party partnerships and approaches for integrating new supply sources into an expansive and largely homogenous water system. Additionally, as with any long-term water supply planning effort, the SFPUC must also contend with uncertainties such as new and prospective regulations, climate change and extreme weather events and long-term demand projections. To minimize the risk of overbuilding, the SFPUC's approach involves planning for existing and potential obligations and advancing projects toward implementation based on projected demands on the Regional Water System. The approach is necessarily dynamic as both supply-side and demand-side drivers continue to change over time. As planning continues, whether individual projects proceed to construction will depend on their technical, financial, and institutional feasibility, as well as changes that could affect the drivers of the projected shortages.

AWS Program Planning Priorities and Level of Service Goals and Objectives. The planning priorities of the AWS Program include (i) meeting regulatory requirements including instream flow releases, (ii) meeting existing obligations to existing permanent customers, (iii) determining whether the SFPUC will have long-term water supplies available to make current interruptible customers permanent, and (iv) meeting increased demands of existing and interruptible customers. In conjunction with these planning priorities, the SFPUC considers the level of service goals and objections related to water supply and sustainability when planning for new water supply opportunities. The key level of service goals and objectives relevant to AWS Program planning include (a) meeting dry-year delivery needs while limiting rationing to a maximum 20% system-wide reduction in water service during extended droughts; (b) diversifying water supply options during non-drought and drought periods; (c) improving use of new water sources and drought management, including groundwater, recycled water, conservation, and transfers; (d) meeting, at a minimum, all current and anticipated legal requirements for protection of fish and wildlife habitat; and (e) providing operational flexibility.

AWS Projects. In 2019, the SFPUC identified six regional alternative water supply options under the AWS Program. The SFPUC has been studying the feasibility of these projects. To date, two regional projects remain active, three projects have been deferred, and one project has been cancelled, each as further described below. Because of the inherent technical, institutional and operational complexities, AWS projects are anticipated to be more expensive than

traditional SFPUC capital projects. The 2026 Capital Plan includes approximately $60.2 million for project planning related to the active projects described below, as well as for additional planning efforts for other alternative water supply options.

PureWater Peninsula (formerly Crystal Springs Purified Water)(Active): This project could initially provide 6-8 mgd of water supply through reservoir water augmentation at Crystal Springs Reservoir. A second phase of the project could provide an additional 4-6 mgd (for a total of up to 12 mgd) through direct potable reuse to other partner agencies. Treated wastewater from Silicon Valley Clean Water and the City of San Mateo would go through a water purification process that uses multi-barrier treatment technology to meet State and federal drinking water quality standards. The purified water would be transmitted over 12 miles to Crystal Springs Reservoir and/or other neighboring water service areas. Water conveyed to Crystal Springs Reservoir would be blended with regional surface water supplies and treated again at Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant. An alternative that delivers up to 12 mgd directly into the SFPUC's treated water delivery system was also evaluated and the two project alternatives are currently being reviewed by the SFPUC.

South Bay Purified Water (Active): As described above under " – *General*," one of the main drivers for the SFPUC's future infrastructure water needs is a policy decision before the SFPUC regarding whether to change the status of the cities of San José and Santa Clara from interruptible to permanent customers (see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Wholesale Deliveries – *Status of San José and Santa Clara*" and "*– 2028 Water Supply*"). To help offset the potential incremental dry year impact of adding new obligations and support their request for permanent status, San José and Santa Clara are partnering with the SFPUC to evaluate a new water supply project that could provide 3.5 mgd of dry year supply to the SFPUC. Additionally, this project would produce 6.5 mgd of supply in all years for use by San José and Santa Clara. Initial feasibility of the project was completed in July 2023. Discussions regarding agreements are ongoing and additional technical analysis will be needed before project planning is concluded.

Daly City Recycled Water Expansion (Deferred): This project was intended to produce approximately 1.0 mgd of recycled water on an average annual basis, resulting in approximately 0.7 mgd of additional dry-year potable supply availability in the South Westside Groundwater Basin. The primary purpose of this project was to provide recycled water for certain cemetery and irrigation use, offsetting existing groundwater pumping from the South Westside Groundwater Basin, and thereby increasing the reliability of the basin for additional drinking water supply during droughts for SFPUC customers. This project has been deferred due to, among other reasons, high capital cost requirements and reduced water supply benefits to the SFPUC, and may be reevaluated in the future.

Alameda County Water District – Union Sanitary District Purified Water Partnership (Deferred): This project was intended to provide Alameda County Water District ("**ACWD**") with a new purified water supply by treating wastewater from Union Sanitary District ("**USD**") to meet drinking water standards and transmitting such purified water to the Quarry Lakes Groundwater Recharge Area to supplement recharge into the Niles Cone Groundwater Basin or for other uses in the ACWD service area. The first phase of the project was intended to provide ACWD with up to 5.4 mgd of additional water supply, enabling an in-lieu exchange with the SFPUC that would preserve more water in SFPUC's Regional Water System. This project has been deferred due to, among other reasons, relatively high capital cost requirements and USD and ACWD pursuing other, higher-priority planning efforts, and may be reevaluated in the future.

Calaveras Reservoir Expansion (Deferred): This project was intended to add up to an additional 289,000 acre-feet, or 94 billion gallons, of water storage to the Calaveras Dam (which currently has a water storage capacity of 96,850 acre-feet, or 31 billion gallons) that could be available in all water year types. This project included raising the dam, expanding the capacity of the outlet structures and spillway, and adding necessary transmission and pumping infrastructure to convey water to the Calaveras Reservoir. This project has been deferred due to, among other reasons, high capital cost requirements, and may be reevaluated in the future.

Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion (Cancelled): This project was a storage project proposed by Contra Costa Water District ("**CCWD**"), which owns and operates the existing Los Vaqueros Reservoir located in northeastern Contra Costa County. CCWD invited other water agencies in the region, including the SFPUC, to participate in the project, which would have enlarged the reservoir for use by the other agencies, to increase water supply reliability for customers and to provide ecosystem benefits to south-of-Delta wildlife refuges and Delta fisheries. The SFPUC

contemplated storage space in the project to provide a dry-year water supply benefit to the SFPUC's customers; however, CCWD cancelled the project in fall 2024 due to, among other reasons, high capital cost requirements, reduced water supply benefits, and other project risks.

San Joaquin Valley Projects

In addition to the AWS Program described above, the SFPUC is also exploring opportunities for collaboration in the San Joaquin Valley that could reduce potential future water supply shortfalls in the SFPUC service area. These three concepts are described below.

Groundwater Banking. Groundwater banking in the Modesto Irrigation District and Turlock Irrigation District service areas could be used to provide some additional water supply to meet instream releases in dry years reducing water supply impacts to the SFPUC service area. For example, additional surface water could be provided to irrigators in wet years, which would off-set the use of groundwater, thereby allowing the groundwater to remain in the basin rather than be consumptively used. The groundwater that remains in the basin can then be used in a subsequent dry year for irrigation, subsequently freeing up surface water that would have otherwise been delivered to irrigators to meet instream flow requirements.

Inter-Basin Collaborations. Inter-Basin collaborations could include establishing a partnership between interests on the Tuolumne River and those on the Stanislaus River, which would allow responsibility for streamflow to be assigned variably based on the annual hydrology. The Tuolumne system tends to spill more excess flow in wetter years than the Stanislaus system, and this excess flow could be shaped and credited to meet Stanislaus system requirements, while New Melones Reservoir in the Stanislaus system is refilling. Stored water could then be partially used to provide required streamflow to meet Stanislaus and Tuolumne requirements in future dry years.

Dry Year Water Transfer. The SFPUC has initiated discussions with Oakdale Irrigation District to transfer 2 mgd (2,240 acre-feet) from Oakdale Irrigation District in dry years only. While no transfer has been secured to date, the SFPUC continues to explore potential transfer opportunities on the Tuolumne River and throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

Local Water Supply Initiatives

The SFPUC is also continually expanding efforts to advance conservation and develop local supply sources. These ongoing local programs are described below.

Local Water Conservation. The SFPUC maintains a robust water conservation program and has one of the lowest rates of per capita water use in California. Conservation programs include rebates and incentives for replacement of inefficient plumbing fixtures, appliances and equipment; water-wise evaluations; free water-saving devices; tools to help customers understand and manage their water use; education; and outreach.

Onsite Water Reuse. The Onsite Water Reuse Program allows for the collection, treatment and use of alternate water sources for non-potable applications in individual buildings and at the district-scale. The SFPUC also administers the Non-Potable Water Ordinance that requires onsite water reuse systems for new development projects of 100,000 gross square feet or greater in San Francisco, and the Stormwater Management Ordinance that outlines the mandatory requirements for managing post-construction stormwater runoff and provides guidance on how to incorporate green infrastructure into site design.

Ideation to Implementation (I2I) Program: This program helps the SFPUC better align and overcome challenges that can affect successful implementation of new water supply and conservation projects. These challenges may be related to regulations, resource availability, climate uncertainty, or affordability. The I2I Program encourages creativity, collaboration, and opportunities for partnership in addressing implementation challenges. Examples of the I2I Program's work that have been executed are demonstrations of new technologies and grant funds to support partnership opportunities for applications such as piloting atmospheric water generation technology, supporting heat recovery in non-potable systems, testing leak detection, and developing guidance for breweries treating process water for reuse.

PureWaterSF: This program aims to plan for the phased development of a new local drinking water supply in San Francisco of approximately 2-8 mgd through the treatment of recycled water from the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant (PureWaterSF – West) and the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (PureWaterSF – East). From 2018-2020, the SFPUC completed a temporary small-scale research and demonstration purified water (potable reuse) project at its headquarters. In 2022, the SFPUC completed an evaluation of four alternative scenarios for purified water development. The SFPUC is currently reviewing treatability and developing preliminary design for an initial phase of the PureWaterSF – East project. The initial phase includes the planning and construction of a purified water public engagement and operator training facility. While the total cost of this program has not been determined and requires further analysis, the SFPUC anticipates significant capital expenditures will be necessary for full implementation.

Environmental Planning Considerations

Projects undertaken by the SFPUC are subject to CEQA and certain projects involving the participation of federal agencies, including projects on federal land, are also subject to the National Environmental Policy Act ("**NEPA**"). The San Francisco Planning Department (the "**Planning Department**"), acting as the CEQA lead agency under Chapter 31 of the City's Administrative Code ("**Chapter 31**"), generally coordinates CEQA review of SFPUC projects. The SFPUC also coordinates with federal NEPA lead agencies to prepare NEPA documentation for SFPUC projects.

Under CEQA, a project that may have a significant effect on the environment and is to be carried out or approved by a public agency must comply with a comprehensive environmental review process, including the preparation of an environmental impact report ("**EIR**"). The EIR reflects not only an independent technical analysis of the project's potential environmental impacts, but also the comments of other agencies with some form of jurisdiction over the project and the comments of interested members of the public. Contents of the EIR include a detailed statement of the project's significant environmental effects; any such effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented; mitigation measures proposed to minimize such effects; alternatives to the proposed project; the relationship between short-term and long-term impacts; any significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from the project; the project's growth-inducing impacts; and a brief statement setting forth the agency's reasons for determining that certain effects are not significant and hence do not require discussion in the EIR. Before approving a project, the SFPUC must make findings on whether or how it can mitigate the significant environmental effects of the project. If the project requires mitigation, the SFPUC must adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program on how the mitigation is carried out during project implementation. If a project's significant effects can be mitigated, the SFPUC can adopt a written statement (called a mitigated negative declaration) or if the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, the SFPUC may adopt a written statement (called a negative declaration) to that effect and in both cases need not prepare an EIR. After deciding to approve or carry out a project, either following the EIR process or after adopting a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration, the Planning Department must file a notice of such determination with the Office of the County Clerk. CEQA also contains several exemptions, which the SFPUC uses for its projects when appropriate.

Any action or proceeding challenging the Planning Department determination must be brought within 30 days following the filing of such notice. Actions have been, and in the future may be, filed challenging a project's compliance with CEQA, including the adequacy of the EIR and other environmental documents for particular projects. If an action challenging the SFPUC's compliance with CEQA is successful, the particular project could be delayed, revised, suspended or canceled.

As part of its regular planning and budgetary process, the SFPUC gives careful attention to environmental considerations. All projects are evaluated under the SFPUC's environmental evaluation procedures (Infrastructure Procedures 7.01 and 7.02), developed in compliance with federal and State laws and regulations, City ordinances and the City's Administrative Code procedures, including Chapter 31.

Prior to the sale of new money bonds, the Planning Department will issue a "Planning Certificate" required under Proposition E. The Planning Certificate will identify the status of environmental review for each capital project to be funded under the proposed bond sale and the type of CEQA document either completed or to be completed for each project. CEQA compliance must be completed for each project prior to project approval or approval to award a

construction contract to implement any project to be funded by the proposed bond sale. The Planning Certificate for the projects to be financed by the 2025D Bonds and the 2025E Bonds was issued in August 2024.

FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Long Term Financing of Capital Program

The Water Enterprise's 10-year financial plan for Fiscal Years 2025-26 to 2034-35 (the "**2026 Financial Plan**") was adopted by the Commission on February 11, 2025. The 2026 Financial Plan is based on the 2026 Capital Plan. Pursuant to the 2026 Financial Plan, long-term debt financing, comprised of additional Bonds and State Revolving Fund loans, is projected to fund approximately $1.908 billion of the 2026 Capital Plan, and revenue (pay-as-you-go) funding is projected to fund approximately $1.134 billion of the 2026 Capital Plan. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans."

The SFPUC's long-term capital and financial planning is performed on an annual rolling 10-year forward looking basis. Although the 2026 Financial Plan currently contemplates the issuance of additional Bonds and State Revolving Fund loans to finance the capital program, the SFPUC may also consider additional financing options in the future, including but not limited to other parity or subordinate federal and State loans.

Interim Funding Program Facilities

The SFPUC's Interim Funding Program is a short-term financing program consisting of a combination of lines of credit and credit facilities, liquidity facilities and letters of credit supporting the SFPUC's ability to issue short-term indebtedness, including the issuance of Commercial Paper Notes. The SFPUC utilizes the Interim Funding Program to meet the expenditure and encumbrance needs of capital projects on an interim basis through design and into the early project construction phase. The Interim Funding Program is authorized for the Water Enterprise in the aggregate principal amount of $750 million. Of this amount, $550 million is authorized for the SFPUC to issue Commercial Paper Notes and the remaining $200 million is in the form of separate bank revolving credit agreements, each of which permits the SFPUC to make draws directly from respective bank, with the SFPUC's payment obligation evidenced by the Revolving Notes. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Subordinate Debt and Interim Funding Program."

Interim funding program obligations are then refunded and consolidated into either long-term revenue bond issues or a Parity State Loan when the outstanding and encumbered amount of the interim funding obligations approaches authorized limits. This approach allows the SFPUC to take advantage of historically lower short-term interest rates, and to size and closely time long-term financings with projected need.

As of May 28, 2025, the SFPUC had tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $312.4 million, taxable Commercial Paper Notes outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of $20.0 million and no amount outstanding under the Revolving Notes. All of the outstanding tax-exempt Commercial Paper Notes will be refunded with proceeds of the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE." The SFPUC anticipates issuing additional Commercial Paper Notes and making draws directly on the revolving credit agreements to provide interim financing for Water Enterprise capital projects.

Sources of Funding the Capital Improvement Program

The following table sets forth the projected sources of funds for the first five years of the Water Enterprise's capital improvement program as set forth in the 2026 Capital Plan.

TABLE 16
WATER ENTERPRISE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FUNDING SOURCES[1]
FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30
(IN THOUSANDS)

Appropriations	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	Total
Revenue Bonds / Parity State Loan	$458,266	$524,965	$308,595	$205,080	$144,827	$1,641,733
Water Revenues	102,726	90,369	108,840	104,943	109,660	516,538
Capacity Charge Revenues	1,412	1,469	1,528	1,589	1,652	7,650
Total Sources[2]	$562,404	$616,803	$418,963	$311,612	$256,139	$2,165,921

(1) Amounts are based on anticipated appropriations and are projections from the Water Enterprise 2026 Capital Plan. Actual results may differ materially from these projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS."
(2) Totals may not add due to rounding.
Source: SFPUC.

The repayment of projected principal and interest on future debt issues has been incorporated into the development of the SFPUC's approved retail water rates through Fiscal Year 2025-26, and has also been reflected in the remaining projection period set forth in the 2026 Financial Plan. Pursuant to the WSA, a share of debt service associated with improvements to the Regional Water System is the responsibility of the Wholesale Customers.

Pursuant to the 2026 Financial Plan, the SFPUC projects that retail water rates will increase annually by an average of approximately 6.2% from Fiscal Year 2025-26 to Fiscal Year 2034-35. On May 23, 2023, the Commission approved retail water rates and charges for the three-year period effective July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2026. However, no retail rate increases beyond June 30, 2026, have been proposed to, or adopted by, the Commission or submitted to the Board of Supervisors, and any future retail water rate increases are subject to future approval by the Commission, subject to the Board of Supervisors' ability to reject rate increases. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue."

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

General

The SFPUC is a department of the City and, as such, the financial operations of the SFPUC's three enterprises are included in the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report of the City and shown as enterprise funds. *The City's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report is not incorporated by reference herein.*

The following information is provided with respect to the Water Enterprise only and does not purport to reflect the financial position of the SFPUC or the City as a whole.

Basis of Accounting. The accounts of the Water Enterprise are organized based on a proprietary fund type, specifically an enterprise fund. The financial activities of the Water Enterprise are accounted for on a flow of economic resources measurement focus, using the accrual basis of accounting. Under this method, all assets and liabilities associated with its operations are included on the statement of net position; revenues are recorded when earned, and expenses are recorded when liabilities are incurred.

The SFPUC applies all applicable GASB pronouncements.

City Budget Process. The SFPUC's operating and capital budget preparation and approval is a part of a City-wide process. The SFPUC is one of several departments that prepares biennial budgets. The Commission reviews and approves the SFPUC's two-year budget, which is then submitted to the Mayor's Office for review. The Mayor then incorporates the proposed budget, with amendments, into the City-wide budget that is submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval. Under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors may increase or decrease any proposed expenditure in the Mayor's budget so long as the aggregate changes do not cause the expenditures to exceed the total amount of expenditures proposed by the Mayor. The Charter further provides that the Mayor may reduce or reject any expenditure authorized by the Board of Supervisors except appropriations for bond interest, redemption or other fixed charges, subject to reinstatement of any such expenditure by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors.

City Services Auditor. The City Services Auditor ("**CSA**") is an audit function within the Office of the City Controller. The CSA has broad oversight authority and responsibilities including, but not limited to, (i) reporting upon level of effectiveness for City public services, (ii) auditing financial and management performance of City departments and functions, (iii) ensuring the financial integrity and improving the overall performance and efficiency of City government, and (iv) maintaining a whistleblower hotline to investigate upon reports of fraud, waste and abuse.

Sources of Revenue. The Water Enterprise's principal source of revenue is the sale of water to its Retail Customers and wholesale customers. The setting of water rates by the SFPUC is not subject to any State or federal regulatory approval. The SFPUC's ability to generate revenue may be limited by certain provisions of the State Constitution and the Charter of the City. See "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS."

Allocation of Hetch Hetchy Project Costs. A number of the facilities of the Hetch Hetchy Project are joint assets and are used for both water transmission and power generation and transmission, benefitting both Hetch Hetchy Water and the Power Enterprise. All power sales revenues are allocated to the Power Enterprise. Per negotiation with the Wholesale Customers reflected in the terms of the WSA, operating and capital costs benefitting the Power Enterprise and 55% of operating and capital costs that jointly benefit both Hetch Hetchy Water and the Power Enterprise are allocated to the Power Enterprise. Operating and capital costs benefitting Hetch Hetchy Water and 45% of operating and capital costs jointly benefitting both Hetch Hetchy Water and the Power Enterprise are allocated to the Water Enterprise. Costs allocated to the Water Enterprise are paid through an inter-enterprise transfer from the Water Enterprise to Hetch Hetchy Water and Power. Such transfers constitute "Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise." See "– Operating and Maintenance Expenses – *Inter-Enterprise Transfers*."

Wholesale Water Sales Revenue

Wholesale Rate-Setting Process. Wholesale Customer rates are determined annually based upon the Wholesale Customers' collective share of the Water Enterprise's total revenue requirements, known as the "**Wholesale Revenue Requirement**" in the WSA. The Wholesale Revenue Requirement under the WSA consists of the sum of the Wholesale Customers' allocated shares of the following costs of the Water Enterprise in providing water to the Wholesale Customers: operating and maintenance expenses, capital expenses, administrative and general expenses, property taxes, and the "Suburban Hetch Hetchy Assessment," being the costs of operating the Hetch Hetchy Project allocated exclusively to the Water Enterprise or jointly to the Water Enterprise and the Power Enterprise. Payments made by Wholesale Customers can as a general matter be considered by Wholesale Customers to be costs of purchased water, an operation and maintenance expense under applicable accounting rules.

The cost of service for the Wholesale Customers includes a pro-rata share of Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise. Capital costs are recovered under the cash method as needed to cover revenue-funded capital improvements of the Regional Water System and debt service associated with bond-funded capital projects. The operating costs and plant investment for Hetch Hetchy Water and Power are first classified as power-specific, water-specific or joint. The water-related costs and the Water Enterprise's share of joint costs are reflected in the Wholesale Revenue Requirement.

Finally, the WSA contains a rate device known as the balancing account (the "**Balancing Account**"). If the amount of the revenues received in any Fiscal Year is greater than the actual expenses associated with the allocated cost of wholesale service, the amount of the excess is added to the Balancing Account. If the amount of the revenues received in any Fiscal Year is less than the actual expenses associated with the allocated cost of wholesale service, the

amount of the deficit is subtracted from the Balancing Account. As of the end of any Fiscal Year, the Balancing Account may have a positive balance (reflecting amounts "owed" by the SFPUC to the Wholesale Customers) or a negative balance (reflecting amounts "owed" by the Wholesale Customers to the SFPUC). The Balancing Account balance is used to adjust the following year's rate recovery up or down depending on whether there is a shortfall or surplus in the Balancing Account. For Fiscal Year 2022-23, the Balancing Account balance was approximately $10.1 million due from the Wholesale Customers, and for Fiscal Year 2023-24, the Balancing Account balance was approximately $26.1 million due from the Wholesale Customers (*i.e.*, such amounts were "owed" by the Wholesale Customers to the SFPUC). See "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT – Balancing Account."

Statutory and Contractual Limits on Wholesale Water Rates. The sale and delivery of water to the Wholesale Customers under the WSA are subject to the "Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers" of the Water Enterprise adopted by the Commission, as they may from time to time be amended, that are (1) applicable to the sale and delivery of water by the SFPUC to the Wholesale Customers, (2) reasonable, and (3) not inconsistent with either the WSA or with an individual contract.

Wholesale Water Rate Adjustments. Under the WSA, adjustments to the Wholesale Customers' rate schedules, other than emergency rate adjustments and drought pricing, discussed below, are coordinated with the budget development process. If the SFPUC intends to increase Wholesale Customer rates, it is required to provide certain yearly budget information to the Wholesale Customers prior to adoption of any such rate increases. Failure to do so will not prohibit the SFPUC from adoption of such rates, but, in the event of such failure, the Wholesale Customers may either invoke arbitration, or seek injunctive relief to compel the SFPUC to remedy the failure as soon as reasonably practical.

The SFPUC may increase the water rates applicable to the Wholesale Customers without compliance with the above-described procedures in the event of a drought, earthquake, other act of God, malfunctioning of the Regional Water System or other emergency which requires an increase in rates. Rates may be increased on an emergency basis to cover operating expenses and capital costs. Any such emergency rate increase must be accompanied by a rate increase for Retail Customers of an equal percentage.

Any emergency rate surcharge adopted by the SFPUC could go into effect within 30 days of such adoption (subject to any action by the Board of Supervisors) and would remain in effect only until the next budget coordinated rate-setting cycle, at which time it can be reviewed for continuance and modification.

Drought pricing for Wholesale Customers, if required, could also be changed under similar terms and conditions set forth for emergency rate increases. Any drought-related pricing or surcharge adopted by the Commission would also remain in effect only until the next budget coordinated rate-setting cycle.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Historical and Adopted Wholesale Water Rate Adjustments. The following table lists wholesale water rate adjustments since Fiscal Year 2014-15 for the Wholesale Customers.

TABLE 17
HISTORICAL AND ADOPTED PERCENTAGE INCREASES (DECREASES)
IN WHOLESALE WATER RATES

Effective Date	Change in Wholesale Rates[(1)]
July 1, 2014	19.6%
July 1, 2015	28.0
July 1, 2016	9.3
July 1, 2017	0.0
July 1, 2018	0.0
July 1, 2019	0.0
July 1, 2020	0.0
July 1, 2021	0.0
July 1, 2022	15.9
July 1, 2023	9.7
July 1, 2024	8.8

(1) Pursuant to the 25-year Water Supply Agreement, wholesale rates are adopted annually based on an estimate of the Wholesale Revenue Requirement.

Source: SFPUC.

On May 13, 2025, the Commission approved a wholesale rate increase of 2.3%, effective July 1, 2025.

Arbitration for Disputes. The Prior Master Water Sales Contract had a binding arbitration provision for disputes related to wholesale rate setting by the SFPUC. The SFPUC and its Wholesale Customers arbitrated one dispute over the 25-year term of the Prior Master Water Sales Contract. The WSA continues the practice of binding arbitration, and the SFPUC and its Wholesale Customers have resolved other disputes, without invoking arbitration, as part of the true-up process for determining the actual Wholesale Revenue Requirement following the close of each fiscal year.

Retail Water Sales Revenue

Retail Rate Structure. Retail Customers pay a flat monthly service charge based on meter size plus a volumetric charge for water usage based on one-month meter readings. Volumetric charges for single- and multi-family residential customers are based on a two-tiered rate structure, where the first tier is applicable to the first 4 CCF (400 cubic feet) of use per month (single-family) or 3 CCF (300 cubic feet) of use per month (multi-family), and the second tier is applicable to all additional use for both single- and multi-family residential customers. Volumetric charges for non-residential customers are based on a uniform rate. The tables below detail retail water rates for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2024-25.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

TABLE 18
RATES FOR RETAIL WATER SERVICE IN SAN FRANCISCO

	Fiscal Year 2023-24[1]			Fiscal Year 2024-25[1]		
	Single-Family Residential ($/CCF)[2]	Multi-Family Residential ($/CCF)	Non-Residential ($/CCF)	Single-Family Residential ($/CCF)[2]	Multi-Family Residential ($/CCF)	Non-Residential ($/CCF)
Tier 1[3] (0-4 or 0-3 CCF)	10.33	10.19	--	10.85	10.70	--
Tier 2 (All other usage)	11.47	10.94	--	12.05	11.49	--
Uniform	--	--	11.12	--	--	11.68

(1) Rates adopted May 23, 2023.
(2) One "CCF" equals 100 cubic feet of water (equal to 748 gallons).
(3) Tier 1 for single-family residential is from 0-4 CCF; tier 1 for multi-family residential is from 0-3 CCF.
Source: SFPUC.

The retail water rates in the previous table do not reflect any drought surcharges. See "– *Retail Water Rate Adjustments*."

The following tables compare the typical monthly charges for representative Retail Customer classes based on average use for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2024-25.

TABLE 19A
TYPICAL MONTHLY CHARGES FOR RETAIL WATER SERVICE IN SAN FRANCISCO
FISCAL YEAR 2023-24

Customer Type	Average Use (CCF)	Meter Size	Fixed Charge	Volume Charge	Total Monthly Charges (Volume + Fixed)
Average Single-Family Residence	4.4	5/8"	$16.64	$46.37	$63.01
Larger Single-Family Residence	12.0	5/8"	16.64	133.08	149.72
Large Apartment Building	101.0	3"	151.35	1,005.94	1,157.27
Large Office	351.0	3"	151.35	3,903.12	4,054.47
Department Store	340.0	4"	232.18	3,780.80	4,012.98
Hotel	3,314.0	6"	456.70	36,851.68	37,308.38

Source: SFPUC.

TABLE 19B
TYPICAL MONTHLY CHARGES FOR RETAIL WATER SERVICE IN SAN FRANCISCO
FISCAL YEAR 2024-25

Customer Type	Average Use (CCF)	Meter Size	Fixed Charge	Volume Charge	Total Monthly Charges (Volume + Fixed)
Average Single-Family Residence	4.8	5/8"	$17.48	$49.43	$66.91
Larger Single-Family Residence	12.0	5/8"	17.48	139.80	157.28
Large Apartment Building	101.0	3"	158.92	1,056.21	1,215.13
Large Office	351.0	3"	158.92	4,099.68	4,258.60
Department Store	340.0	4"	243.79	3,971.20	4,214.99
Hotel	3,314.0	6"	479.54	38,707.52	39,187.06

Source: SFPUC.

Retail Rate-Setting Process. The SFPUC is authorized and required under the Charter and Proposition E to set rates, fees, and other charges in connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days of submission – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 30 days, the rates will become effective without further action. If the Board of Supervisors rejects proposed rates, the prior rates remain in effect.

Under the Charter, in setting retail rates, fees, and charges (for water, wastewater and power utility services) the SFPUC is required to do the following:

(1) Establish rates, fees, and charges at levels sufficient to improve or maintain financial condition and bond ratings at or above levels equivalent to highly rated utilities of each enterprise under its jurisdiction, meet requirements and covenants under all bond resolutions and indentures (including, without limitation, increases necessary to pay for the retail customers' share of the debt service on bonds and operating expenses of any State financing authority), and provide sufficient resources for the continued financial health (including appropriate reserves), operation, maintenance and repair of each enterprise, consistent with good utility practice.

(2) Retain an independent rate consultant to conduct rate and cost of service studies for each utility at least once every five years.

(3) Set retail rates, fees, and charges based on the cost of service.

(4) Conduct all studies mandated by applicable State and federal law to consider implementing connection fees for water and clean water facilities servicing new development.

(5) Conduct studies of rate-based conservation incentives and rate structures to help low-income users, and to use the results of such studies to establish rates, fees, and charges, in accordance with applicable State and federal laws.

(6) Adopt annually a rolling five-year forecast of rates, fees and other charges.

(7) Establish a Rate Fairness Board consisting of seven members: the City Administrator or their designee; the Controller or their designee; the Director of the Mayor's Office of Public Finance or their designee; two residential retail customers, one appointed by the Mayor and one by the Board of Supervisors; and two business retail customers, one a large business customer appointed by the Mayor and one a small business customer appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Duties for the Rate Fairness Board include:

   (a) an annual review of a five-year rate forecast;

   (b) hold one or more public hearings on annual rate recommendations before the SFPUC adopts rates;

   (c) provide a report and recommendations to the SFPUC on any rate proposal; and,

   (d) in connection with periodic rate studies, recommend rate policies and cost allocations among retail utility customer classifications, subject to any outstanding bond requirements.

The Rate Fairness Board is not authorized to reject proposed rates approved by the Commission.

Retail rates and the rate-setting process must also comply with the requirements of the State Constitution, including notice, protest and public hearing requirements. See "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS – State Law Limitations."

Retail Water Rate Adjustments. The SFPUC's retail rates and charges for delivered water are set to equal the cost of operation, maintenance, replacement, debt service and other costs incurred in gathering, treating, and delivering water to its retail customers. The SFPUC regularly reviews and has often increased its retail water rates to fund operating and capital costs. Furthermore, the SFPUC may adjust and re-classify rates, fees, and charges, but will not decrease them unless, following such reduction, the rates, fees, and charges will continue to be sufficient to meet the rate covenants set forth in the Indenture. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants."

In 2022, pursuant to the Charter, the SFPUC retained an independent rate consultant to conduct a water and wastewater cost of service study to establish a proposed three-year water and wastewater retail rate schedule for Fiscal Years 2023-24 through 2025-26 (the "**2023 Rate Study**"). The SFPUC took several measures to mitigate the risk of over-projecting volumes, which could potentially lead to revenue shortfalls. First, projections in the 2023 Rate Study were based on actual water usage for Fiscal Year 2022-23, which reflected decreased water usage due to the COVID-19 pandemic, conservation related to the recent drought, and observed population declines in San Francisco. Second, the projections in the 2023 Rate Study assumed that San Francisco never fully recovers from the decline in water usage caused by the pandemic and the resulting shift to remote work and declining daytime population. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Recent Factors Impacting Retail Water Sales." Finally, instead of approving rates for four years, as was done following the two prior rate studies, the SFPUC approved a three-year rate schedule to allow for a realignment of rates to observed sales volumes on a more frequent basis should further declines materialize. Following completion of the 2023 Rate Study in April 2023, the Commission approved a three-year water and wastewater retail rate schedule for Fiscal Years 2023-24 through 2025-26 on May 23, 2023. In accordance with the Charter, the next rate study will be conducted by Fiscal Year 2026-27.

The following table lists historical retail water rate adjustments since Fiscal Year 2014-15 through Fiscal Year 2024-25, and the adopted retail water rate adjustment for Fiscal Year 2025-26. There was no water rate adjustment for Fiscal Year 2022-23.

TABLE 20
HISTORICAL AND ADOPTED PERCENTAGE INCREASES (DECREASES)
IN RETAIL WATER RATES

Effective Date	Change in Retail Rates
July 1, 2014[(1)]	--
July 1, 2015[(1)]	12.0%
July 1, 2016[(1)]	10.0
July 1, 2017[(1)]	7.0
July 1, 2018[(2)]	7.8
July 1, 2019[(2)]	8.3
July 1, 2020[(2)]	7.8
July 1, 2021[(2)]	7.9
July 1, 2022[(3)]	0.0
July 1, 2023[(4)]	5.0
July 1, 2024[(4)]	5.0
July 1, 2025[(4)]	5.0

(1) Four-year retail rates effective July 1, 2014.
(2) Four-year retail rates effective July 1, 2018.
(3) No water rate adjustment for Fiscal Year 2022-23.
(4) Three-year retail rates effective July 1, 2023.

Source: SFPUC.

As part of the three-year water and wastewater retail rate schedule for Fiscal Years 2023-24 through 2025-26, the Commission approved the implementation of a temporary drought surcharge that is levied only when the Commission puts the SFPUC's Water Shortage Contingency Plan into effect, requesting that customers reduce water usage. When implemented, the drought surcharge increases the volumetric water and wastewater rates for all customer types up to the percentages shown in the following table. These percentages are calculated to recover costs based on reduced billed volumes. The SFPUC may set the percentage surcharge lower than shown on the following table to ensure that rates do not exceed the costs of providing water and wastewater services to customers.

TABLE 21
TEMPORARY DROUGHT SURCHARGE[(1)]

Water Shortage Contingency Plan Stage	Target Water Usage Reduction	Drought Surcharge on Volumetric Water & Wastewater Rates
Stages 1-3	5%	Up to 5%
Stage 4	5-18%	Up to 18%
Stage 5-6	18-32%	Up to 32%

(1) Effective July 1, 2023.
Source: SFPUC.

Discount Programs. Effective in 2023, the SFPUC's Customer Assistance Program offers a two-tiered discount off water charges for individually metered single-family residential customers. Customers with incomes below 50% of the area median income receive a 25% discount and customers with incomes below 30% of the area median income receive a 40% discount. In addition, the SFPUC's Low-Income Non-Profit Housing Program offers a 15% discount off water charges for residential customers in properties owned and operated by certain nonprofits. Finally, the SFPUC's Community Housing Program offers a 15% discount off water charges for certain single-room-occupancy hotels providing transitional housing to the homeless and general assistance recipients.

Billing and Collection Procedures. Generally, all Retail Customers are billed monthly for their respective metered water use. In the event of non-payment, the SFPUC has the authority and power to discontinue service and, in owner-occupied buildings and master metered apartment buildings, to record liens on property.

Delayed Billing. The SFPUC relies on Advanced Metering Infrastructure ("**AMI**") for the collection of its customer usage information for almost all of its customers. The AMI system uses a transmitter to relay water meter readings to the SFPUC billing system. The AMI system in use is at the mid-point of its useful life and is beginning to experience an acceleration of transmitter malfunction with unit components requiring replacement. In summer 2023, the SFPUC experienced a procurement delay for transmitter replacement parts due to supply chain challenges with the vendor, resulting in a growing backlog of unbilled accounts across the SFPUC's San Francisco service area. In winter 2023-24, the SFPUC's Customer Services Bureau experienced significant turnover of staff, affecting its ability to address the backlog of malfunctioning meter transmission units. Though still recording water usage, the billing system defaulted to estimated monthly billings for three months when a malfunction was detected, and ceased billing if the malfunctioning meter was not addressed. The number of affected unbilled accounts dated back to fall 2023, resulting in approximately $6.6 million in unbilled revenues that were accrued as a receivable in Fiscal Year 2023-24.

The SFPUC immediately implemented an action plan to bill and collect the unbilled revenues that included prioritizing and accelerating field service visits to address malfunctioning meter transmission units; reassigning plumbers from other divisions to accelerate the replacement of the malfunctioning AMI components for usage data to be transmitted from affected meters; expediting the hiring of new staff and retaining contractors to accelerate processing of delayed bills for affected accounts; enhancing the billing system to allow for extended bill estimates, increasing the threshold from three months to 36 months; and developing an automated workflow to expedite the processing of affected accounts with delayed bills and payment plans.

As part of the action plan, the SFPUC also initiated an extensive and proactive customer outreach campaign to provide advance notice to all affected customers of their delayed billing and when it would resume. To assist customers unable to pay the entire amount due, the SFPUC is offering payment plans of up to nine months. The SFPUC anticipates collecting the majority of delayed revenues by June 30, 2025.

Delinquencies. The SFPUC reviews water accounts routinely to determine whether they have a past due balance that is delinquent. Typically, once an account is delinquent, a series of notices are sent to the customer and if payment is still not made, action to shut-off the water supply is initiated. However, if the delinquent account is in the name of the property owner and payment is still not made despite such notices, the customer will receive a lien warning notice. After a lien notice is delivered, a lien hearing is held and, if the bill still remains outstanding, the lien is recorded and can only be removed upon full payment of all unpaid charges, plus administrative fees and interest. Liens not paid

during the Fiscal Year in which they are recorded are transferred to the City Tax Collector's Office, Bureau of Delinquent Revenues, for collection as a lien against the property. Accounts for which property transfers occurred prior to recording the lien and closed accounts with amounts less than $25 are normally written off as uncollectible.

The number of water accounts that are delinquent and the amount of accounts receivable from delinquent bills have grown significantly since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. As of July 1, 2019, the number of delinquent water accounts more than 90 days past due was 3,968 and the amount of accounts receivable from such delinquent water accounts totaled approximately $520.1 thousand. By contrast, as of July 1, 2024, the number of delinquent water accounts more than 90 days past due was 22,433 and the amount of accounts receivable from such delinquent water accounts totaled approximately $10.5 million. The table below shows the amount of accounts receivable from delinquent water accounts for Retail Customers as of July 1, 2022, July 1, 2023 and July 1, 2024.

TABLE 22
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLES AGING REPORT

	As of July 1, 2022		As of July 1, 2023		As of July 1, 2024	
Period	**Amount**	**Percent of Total**	**Amount**	**Percent of Total**	**Amount**	**Percent of Total**
0 - 30 Days	$27,985,674	73.5%	$27,656,269	65.1%	$34,810,384	67.9%
31 - 60 Days	2,453,115	6.4	2,774,744	6.5	4,462,966	8.7
61 - 90 Days	3,425,923	9.0	1,427,331	3.4	1,497,506	2.9
Over 90 Days	4,218,790	11.1	10,644,314	25.0	10,475,447	20.4
Total[(1)]	$38,083,502	100.0%	$42,502,658	100.0%	$51,246,303	100.0%
Credit Balances	($903,834)		($855,799)		($1,632,263)	
Total Aged Receivables	$37,179,668		$41,646,859		$49,614,040	
Less Receivables from Municipal Customers	($1,095,247)		($3,416,076)		($3,548,023)	
Less Allowance for Doubtful Accounts	($4,571,491)		($9,270,191)		($10,296,945)	
Accounts Receivable, Net of Allowance	$31,512,930		$28,960,592		$35,769,072	

(1) Totals may not add due to rounding.
Source: SFPUC.

In March 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the SFPUC first suspended shutoffs of water and sewer service and prohibited the imposition of late payment penalties, fees, and charges (the "**COVID-19 Moratorium**"). In addition, in May 2020, the SFPUC first authorized a temporary Emergency Customer Assistance Program ("**E-CAP**"), offering a discount off water charges for qualifying residential and commercial ratepayers. Between 2020 and 2023, the SFPUC periodically extended and modified the COVID-19 Moratorium and E-CAP. In 2023, the SFPUC changed the Customer Assistance Program to incorporate practices from E-CAP (for current program details, see "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue – *Discount Programs*"), and further approved exemptions from disconnections of water and sewer service and liens due to unpaid bills for households enrolled in the Customer Assistance Program and for customers who fall between 51% to 80% of area median income who experience extenuating circumstances. In November 2024, the Commission approved sunsetting the COVID-19 pandemic procedures for water and sewer customer bill collection and delinquency actions; resuming normal business practices for shutoffs, liens, and fines; amending water and wastewater shutoff and lien policies to provide exemptions, subject to limitations, to (i) customers with an outstanding bill balance of $100 or less, (ii) customers enrolled in the Customer Assistance Program, and (iii) customers within defined area mean income limits who qualify for extenuating circumstances. Such changes went into effect January 1, 2025. The SFPUC anticipates that utilizing all collection tools available will result in a significant reduction of delinquent water accounts.

Comparative Retail Water Rates. The following table compares monthly charges by selected California water providers for a typical single-family residential usage account with a 5/8-inch meter.

TABLE 23
COMPARATIVE TYPICAL MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL WATER CHARGES[(1)]

Water Provider	Typical Monthly Charge
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission[(2)]	**$ 68.83**
City of Oakland (East Bay Municipal Utility District)	80.79
City of San José	99.05
Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power & Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment)	99.35
City of San Diego	104.53
City of Santa Clara	130.22

(1) Typical monthly charge has been compiled by the SFPUC based on rates that have been obtained from publicly available sources and have not been independently verified by the SFPUC.
(2) Based on water charges as of July 1, 2024.
Source: SFPUC.

Affordability. Nearly all Retail Customers are also served by the Wastewater Enterprise and such Retail Customers receive a single monthly bill reflecting both charges for water service and charges for sewer service. The SFPUC's affordability efforts are therefore focused on the cost of water service and sewer service viewed as a whole. The SFPUC is engaged in a major capital program for the Wastewater Enterprise and anticipates that significant increases in sewer charges will be required in addition to the anticipated retail rate increases for water service described herein. The average residential combined water and sewer bill is projected to increase 8%, 9.7%, and 11.5%, in Fiscal Year 2024-25, Fiscal Year 2025-26, and Fiscal Year 2026-27, respectively. Affordability concerns may impact discussions with respect to retail rates for water service and may, among other things, require the SFPUC to prioritize and defer capital projects for the Water Enterprise.

Capacity Charges

The SFPUC imposes a capacity charge on any Retail Customer requesting a new connection, added collection or treatment capacity, or a change to an existing connection to the water distribution system. Beginning July 1, 2024, the capacity charge is $2,266 per equivalent 5/8-inch meter. The capacity charge is adjusted on July 1 of each year by the annual change in the 20-City Average Construction Cost Index published by ENR Magazine.

Operating and Maintenance Expenses

"**Operating and Maintenance Expenses**" cover the general operations expenses of the Water Enterprise. These expenses include labor and fringe benefits, contractual services, materials and supplies, depreciation, general and administrative, services from other departments and other miscellaneous costs. See "HISTORICAL OPERATING RESULTS." Services from other departments include payment for services from other City departments, such as the City Attorney's Office and the General Services Agency. Operating and Maintenance Expenses include payments to Hetch Hetchy Water and Power for services related to water storage and delivery. See "– *Inter-Enterprise Transfers*" and "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants."

Allocation of Costs. Various common costs incurred by the SFPUC are allocated among the Water Enterprise, the Wastewater Enterprise and the Power Enterprise. Allocations are based on methodology established by an independent indirect cost study, and SFPUC management's best estimates and may change from year to year depending on activities undertaken by each enterprise and information available. The SFPUC allocated $66.1 million in administrative costs to the Water Enterprise for Fiscal Year 2023-24, which are included in the financial statements under various expense categories, and has budgeted $65.0 million and $67.3 million for such costs for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively.

Inter-Enterprise Transfers. An annual transfer occurs from the Water Enterprise to Hetch Hetchy Water and Power to pay for services related to water storage and delivery. The annual transfer amount was $46.3 million for Fiscal Year 2023-24, and the SFPUC has budgeted $49.2 million and $52.2 million for such transfers for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively. Should Hetch Hetchy Water and Power incur higher capital costs or higher operating costs in the future, the amount of these transfers could increase.

Payments to/from the City.

Payments to City for Interdepartmental Services. A variety of City departments provide services such as engineering, purchasing, legal, telecommunications and human resources to the Water Enterprise, and charge amounts designed to recover those costs. These charges totaled approximately $27.6 million for Fiscal Year 2023-24, and the SFPUC has budgeted $32.0 million and $34.1 million for such charges for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively.

Lease Certificate of Participation Financing. On October 7, 2009, the City issued $167.67 million in fixed-rate Certificates of Participation, Series 2009 C and D, to fund the headquarters of the SFPUC at 525 Golden Gate Avenue. Pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the SFPUC, the SFPUC agreed to reimburse the City General Fund for all costs in connection with this City financing. This obligation is subordinate to debt service on the Bonds and payments related thereto are allocated among the three SFPUC Enterprises. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Other Subordinate Obligations Payable from Revenues."

Water Payments from Other Agencies. The SFPUC receives payments from other agencies of the City for their share of the proportionate cost of the service provided to them. The Water Enterprise charges all City departments for water (with the exception of itself and the San Francisco Fire Department for water dispensed from fire hydrants). The SFPUC collected approximately $12.5 million in payments for Fiscal Year 2023-24, and has budgeted to collect $11.9 million and $12.8 million in payments for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, respectively.

Financial Management Policies

The SFPUC makes no representation that the following policies and targets will not be revised or amended and, except to the extent required for compliance with the terms of the Indenture, makes no representation that these policies will be followed by the SFPUC or that targets will be met.

Debt Management Policies and Procedures. The SFPUC has established "Debt Management Policies and Procedures" (the "**Debt Policies**") for debt financing under its jurisdiction. The SFPUC has also established separate "SFPUC Municipal Securities Disclosure Policies and Procedures" (the "**Disclosure Policies**") which are appended to the Debt Policies. The Debt Policies, including the appended Disclosure Policies, apply to all SFPUC enterprises, including the Water Enterprise, and are intended to enable the SFPUC to effectively manage its debt issuance and administration practices and comply with all debt issuance and administration rules and regulations. The Debt Policies are reviewed bi-annually and revised, as necessary, with Commission approval.

Revisions to the Debt Policies were most recently adopted by the Commission in 2019. This included revisions to three key areas:

(1) Disclosure – The Disclosure Policies were revised to cover two amendments that were made to Rule 15c2-12, effective February 27, 2019 (the "**Rule 15c2-12 Amendments**"). See the Listed Events 15 and 16 in "APPENDIX E – FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE." In addition, pursuant to the Disclosure Policies, the SFPUC developed a Disclosure Practices Working Group (the "**DPWG**"). The DPWG meets at least semiannually to better and more effectively administer the SFPUC's continuing disclosure requirements, particularly to monitor the SFPUC's financial obligations and financial difficulties, if any, in light of the Rule 15c2-12 Amendments. The DPWG is comprised of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant General Manager, Business Services, two Deputy Chief Financial Officers and the Debt Manager of the SFPUC, with legal consultation from the City Attorney's Office and the SFPUC's outside disclosure counsel.

(2) Variable Rate Obligations – The Debt Policies, which set forth and describe various types of debt obligations that the SFPUC may issue, were revised to cover new amendments made to the Wastewater bond indenture that will allow the SFPUC to issue variable rate obligations of the Wastewater Enterprise with more market-standard provisions. These amendments do not apply to any variable rate obligations issued by the Water Enterprise.

(3) WIFIA Loans – The Debt Policies were revised to add WIFIA loans as a permitted form of low-cost debt financing instrument, comparable to the low-cost State Revolving Fund loans that the SFPUC has, from time-to-time, executed with the SWRCB. No WIFIA loans have been executed for the Water Enterprise.

Debt Service Coverage Policy. The Commission adopted a debt service coverage policy (the "**Debt Service Coverage Policy**") in 2017, which applies to all SFPUC enterprises, including the Water Enterprise. Pursuant to the Debt Service Coverage Policy, to ensure that the SFPUC maintains access to low-cost capital and retains financial flexibility for contingencies, the SFPUC will aim to adopt budgets, rates and financial plans that generate revenues such that debt service coverage calculated on an Indenture basis (including certain available fund balances) will be at least 1.35 times and debt service coverage calculated on a current basis (Net Revenues divided by debt service on Bonds and Parity Loans) will be at least 1.10 times.

Separate from the Debt Service Coverage Policy, the Indenture includes a rate covenant that debt service coverage calculated on an Indenture basis (including certain available fund balances) will be at least 1.25 times. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants – *Debt Service Coverage*" and "HISTORICAL OPERATING RESULTS."

Capital Financing Policy. The Commission adopted a capital financing policy (the "**Capital Financing Policy**") in 2017, which applies to all SFPUC enterprises, including the Water Enterprise. The SFPUC relies mainly on current revenue and debt financing to pay for capital assets or improvements. According to the Capital Financing Policy, the appropriate mix of current revenues versus debt financing depends, in part, on the capital investment lifecycle of the Water Enterprise. Accordingly, the SFPUC has determined that over the 10-year financial planning horizon, the SFPUC will aim to pay for a minimum ranging between 15% and 30% of the Water Enterprise's capital budget from current revenues.

Fund Balance Reserve Policy. The Commission adopted a fund balance reserve policy (the "**Fund Balance Reserve Policy**") in 2017, which applies to all SFPUC enterprises, including the Water Enterprise. Pursuant to the Fund Balance Reserve Policy, for the time period covered in the 10-year financial plan, the SFPUC will aim to propose operating and capital budgets and rates for adoption such that the Fund Balance Reserve totals a minimum of 90 days or 25% of operations and maintenance expenses (including programmatic projects and excluding debt service and revenue-funded capital) throughout the forecast period. Amounts in excess of such minimum will be considered for contingencies and rate stabilization.

Affordability Policy. The Commission adopted its most recent affordability policy (the "**Affordability Policy**") in 2023, which applies to the Water Enterprise and the Wastewater Enterprise. Pursuant to the Affordability Policy, the SFPUC will, when adopting rates and approving budgets and financial plans, review the average residential combined water and sewer bill over the next 20 years, and aim to set rates that will result in the average residential combined bill not exceeding 3% of income for a "typical" customer (defined as the 40th percentile San Francisco household income), 7% of income for a "low-income" customer (defined as the 20th percentile San Francisco household income), and 5% of income for a "low-income" customer after accounting for enrollment in applicable low-income discount programs. If such average residential combined bills are projected to exceed the targets within the 20-year period, the SFPUC must provide a rationale and develop strategies to reduce costs, including providing progress reports to the Commission in subsequent budget and financial plan adoptions.

Investment of SFPUC Funds

The SFPUC's pooled deposits and investments are invested pursuant to State law and the investment policy established from time to time by the City Treasurer and overseen by the Treasury Oversight Committee. The current policy seeks the preservation of capital, liquidity and yield, in that order of priority. Under the City Treasurer's current investment procedures, the SFPUC's pooled deposits and investments are invested in the City's larger pooled investment fund (the "**City Pool**"). Among other purposes, the City Pool serves in effect as a disbursement account

for expenditures from the City's various segregated and pooled funds. Investments are generally made so that securities can be held to maturity. The City Treasurer calculated the weighted average maturity of these investments as of March 31, 2025, to be 470 days (most recent data available).

The following table sets forth the approximate book values of the investments held in the City Pool reported by the City Treasurer as of March 31, 2025. The Water Enterprise's pooled deposits and investments accounted for approximately $490.4 million, or approximately 2.70% of such amounts. The Wastewater Enterprise and the Power Enterprise each have their own pooled deposits and investments that are separate from the Water Enterprise.

TABLE 24
CITY POOLED INVESTMENT FUND
(AS OF MARCH 31, 2025)

Investments	Book Value (millions)
U.S. Treasuries	$ 3,933.6
Federal Agencies	6,698.7
Public Time Deposits	60.0
Negotiable CDs	2,988.0
Commercial Paper	1,283.1
Medium Term Notes	164.0
Money Market Funds	2,415.6
Supranationals	286.9
Secured Bank Deposit	354.6
Total[(1)]	$18,184.5

(1) Total may not add due to rounding.
Source: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector of the City and County of San Francisco.

The SFPUC's non-pooled deposits and investments consist primarily of funds related to the SFPUC's Outstanding Bonds, which are invested pursuant to policy established by the SFPUC, subject to the restrictions contained in the applicable bond documentation.

Risk Management and Insurance

The SFPUC's risk management program encompasses both self-insured and insured coverage. Risk assessments and coverage are coordinated by the SFPUC Risk Manager through the Office of the City Administrator, Risk Management Division. With certain exceptions, the City and SFPUC's general approach is to first evaluate self-insurance for the risk of loss to which it is exposed. Based on this analysis, the SFPUC has determined that mitigating risk through a "self-retention" mechanism is more economical as it manages risks internally and administers, adjusts, settles, defends and pays claims from budgeted resources (*i.e.*, pay-as-you-go). When economically more viable or when required by debt financing covenants, the SFPUC obtains commercial insurance.

At least annually, the City reviews and actuarially determines general liability and workers' compensation liabilities, which are recorded as "Damages and Claims" and "Accrued Worker's Compensation" in the financial statements.

The SFPUC does not maintain commercial earthquake coverage, with certain minor exceptions, such as a sub-limit for fire-sprinkler leakage due to earthquake under the Property Insurance program.

The following is a summary of the SFPUC's coverage approach to risk:

Primary Risks	Typical Coverage Approach
General Liability	Purchased Insurance & Self-Insured
Property	Purchased Insurance & Self-Insured
Electronic Data Processing	Purchased Insurance & Self-Insured
Workers' Compensation	Self-Insured through City-Wide Pool
Other Risks	**Typical Coverage Approach**
Surety Bonds	Purchased and Contractually Transferred
Professional Liability	Combination of Self-Insured, Purchased Insurance and Contractual Risk Transfer
Errors & Omissions	Combination of Self-Insured, Purchased Insurance and Contractual Risk Transfer
Builder's Risk	Purchased Insurance & Contractual Risk Transfer
Public Officials Liability	Purchased Insurance
Employment Practices Liability	Purchased Insurance
Crime	Purchased Insurance
Cyber Liability	Purchased Insurance
Tenants' and Users' Liability Insurance Policy	Purchased Insurance
Active Assailant Policy	Purchased Insurance

The SFPUC's property risk management approach varies depending on whether the facility is currently under construction, or if the property is part of revenue-generating operations. The majority of purchased insurance is for revenue-generating facilities, debt-financed facilities and mandated coverage to meet statutory or contractual requirements. The SFPUC's insured coverage is through an insurance policy purchased by the City specifically for the SFPUC, which provides up to $500 million of coverage against certain losses with respect to scheduled property, including wildfire coverage for certain scheduled assets for Hetch Hetchy Water and Power. The schedule includes properties for the SFPUC's enterprises which have a total value of approximately $3.0 billion. See also "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations – *Insurance Coverage*."

Additionally, the SFPUC acknowledges the importance of aligning strategic planning to the risk management process and has implemented an Enterprise Risk Management program to meet this need. The framework provides a strategic approach to managing operational risks. The Enterprise Risk Management program has been implemented thus far for Information Technology Services, the Power Enterprise and CleanPowerSF and plans are in place to continue implementation across the remainder of the SFPUC as needed.

Capital Project Risk Management. For capital construction projects, similar to the City's practice, the SFPUC has utilized traditional contractual risk transfer, contractor-controlled insurance programs or other alternative insurance programs. Under the latter two approaches, the insurance program usually provides coverage for the entire construction project, along with multiple risk coverages, such as general liability and workers compensation. When a contractual risk transfer is used for capital construction risks, the SFPUC requires each contractor to provide its own insurance, while ensuring that the full scope of work be covered with satisfactory levels to limit the SFPUC's risk exposure balanced by that which is commercially available.

Performance bonds are required, and builder's risk insurance must be purchased, in most phases of the construction contracting process for such phases, as bid, performance, and payment or maintenance. Additionally, bonds may be required in other contracts where goods or services are provided to ensure compliance with applicable terms and conditions such as warranty.

Builder's risk policies of insurance are required to be provided either through an owner-controlled insurance program or the contractor on all construction projects for the full value of the construction.

Professional liability policies are either directly purchased insurance on behalf of the SFPUC, transferred through contract to the contracted professional, or retained through self-insurance on a case-by-case basis depending on the size, complexity or scope of construction or professional service contracts. Professional liability policies are typically purchased for services provided by engineers, architects, design professionals and other licensed or certified professional service providers. See also "RISK FACTORS – Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations – *Casualty Losses*."

HISTORICAL OPERATING RESULTS

The historical results of operations reflected in the following table are based on the tables contained in the SFPUC's audited financial statements entitled "Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position" and "Statements of Cash Flows" for the Fiscal Years listed. This table excludes certain non-operating revenue and expenses included in the "Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position" table in the audited financial statements. Consequently, "Operating and Investment Income" presented in this table differs from "Change in net position" in the "Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position" table in the audited financial statements. The calculation of debt service coverage includes net operating income and funds not budgeted to be spent in the next twelve months and legally available to pay debt service, as permitted under the Indenture. The audited financial statements of the Water Enterprise for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2022-23, prepared by the SFPUC, are attached as Appendix C to this Official Statement. The audited financial statements were audited by Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP, independent certified public accountants. The following table should be read in conjunction with such financial statements. Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP has not reviewed the following table. See "APPENDIX C – SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS."

In the following discussion, all $'s are in thousands.

The Water Enterprise's total revenues of $704,041 in Fiscal Year 2023-24 represented a decrease of $1,402 or 0.2% from prior year. Increases included $13,941 from interest and investment income, $1,926 in other operating revenues, and $134 in other non-operating revenues. These increases were offset by decreases of $12,284 in charges for services, and $4,726 in rents and concessions. Since Fiscal Year 2019-20, revenues have increased $27,543 or 4.6% per year mainly due to rate increases of 15.9% in Fiscal Year 2022-23 and 9.7% in Fiscal Year 2023-24 for wholesale customers, offset by volume declines in the periods during the COVID-19 pandemic and conservation efforts from recent droughts.

In Fiscal Year 2023-24, charges for services were $647,622, a decrease of $12,284 or 1.9% from the prior year mainly due to a higher Balancing Account adjustment for Wholesale Customers in the prior year, offset by adopted rate increases of 9.7% for wholesale customers and 5% for retail customers beginning July 1, 2023.

The Water Enterprise's total operating expenses were $502,318, an increase of $63,481 or 14.5%, resulting from increases of $35,867 in general administrative and other expenses mainly from increased judgement and claims expenses and capital projects spending, $24,070 in personnel services mainly due to pensions based on actuarial estimates. Since Fiscal Year 2019-20, operating expenditures have increased by an average of 6.5% per year. Operating expense increases throughout the period have mainly been due to increases to supply costs, general and administrative costs including judgement claims and litigation expense, and offsetting changes in personnel costs related to cost of living adjustments, and pensions and OPEB.

The Water Enterprise has maintained a "current basis" debt service coverage ratio exceeding the 1.00x level required by the Indenture, and meeting or exceeding the higher policy target of 1.10x set by the Commission. The Water Enterprise has also maintained a debt service coverage ratio including "Other Available Funds" exceeding 1.25x required by the Indenture as well as the higher policy target of 1.35x set by the Commission.

TABLE 25
HISTORICAL REVENUES, OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSES AND DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30 (IN THOUSANDS)[1]

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
OPERATING & INVESTMENT REVENUE					
Charges for Services[2]					
Retail Water Sales	$280,609	$270,514	$297,226	$298,156	$313,408
Wholesale Water Sales[3]	270,144	278,981	240,925	361,750	334,214
Subtotal – Water Sales	$550,753	$549,495	$538,151	$659,906	$647,622
Rental Income[4]	12,124	12,911	13,765	13,282	8,556
Other Revenues[5]	18,305	17,069	22,134	19,843	21,903
Capacity Fees[6]	2,169	1,326	2,163	1,256	863
Investing Activities[7]	10,517	340	(10,896)	11,156	25,097
Total Revenues	$593,868	$581,141	$565,317	$705,443	$704,041
OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSE					
Personnel Services[8]	$119,943	$132,528	$83,385	$135,709	$159,779
Contractual Services[9]	14,523	15,501	13,457	16,919	20,128
Materials and Supplies[10]	14,050	13,175	15,719	20,046	23,195
Depreciation[11]	142,228	144,033	147,904	155,714	155,172
Services of Other Departments[12]	61,128	70,235	73,307	79,910	77,638
General/Administrative & Other[13]	46,245	73,218	67,862	30,539	66,406
Total Operating Expenses	$398,117	$448,690	$401,634	$438,837	$502,318
OPERATING AND INVESTMENT INCOME	$195,751	$132,451	$163,683	$266,606	$201,723
COVERAGE CALCULATION					
Operating and Investment Income	$195,751	$132,451	$163,683	$266,606	$201,723
+Adjustment to Investing Activities[14]	(516)	3,846	13,050	(2,015)	(7,956)
+Depreciation & Non-Cash Expenses	148,294	150,257	151,114	164,817	157,335
+Changes in Working Capital[15]	(20,763)	24,707	(42,906)	(124,668)	(22,917)
+Appropriated Fund Balance[16]	17,181	27,785	21,977	67,949	9,800
= "**Net Revenue**"[17]	$339,947	$339,046	$306,918	$372,689	$337,985
+Other Available Funds[18]	241,931	128,692	103,506	194,075	217,600
Funds Available for Debt Service	$581,878	$467,738	$410,424	$566,764	$555,585
Bond Debt Service[17]	$269,210	$248,427	$279,352	$307,062	$306,369
Debt Service Coverage[19]					
Including "Other Available Funds"[18]	2.16x	1.88x	1.47x	1.85x	1.81x
Current Basis[17] [20]	1.26x	1.36x	1.10x	1.21x	1.10x

(1) Operating and Investment Income presented in this table differs from the Change in Net Assets presented in the Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Assets in the audited financial statements. This table excludes certain elements of non-operating revenue and expenses included in the Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position. Examples of excluded elements are Grant Revenue, Interest Expense and Gains from Sale of Assets.

(2) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 mainly due to a decrease in Balancing Account adjustment for Wholesale Customers in prior year, offset by adopted rates increases of 9.7% for wholesale customers and 5% for retail customers beginning July 1, 2023.

(3) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 mainly due to Balancing Account adjustment for Wholesale Customers and in-lieu groundwater credits given, offset by an adopted rate increase of 9.7% of wholesale customers beginning July 1, 2023.

(4) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to transfer to operating fund for Customer Assistance Program discount program expansion.

(5) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 mainly due to increased consumption for certain City departments and a 5% rate increase in Fiscal Year 2023-24. Also, non-operating revenues were added in Fiscal Year 2021-22 per indenture.

(6) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to additional allowance for doubtful accounts adjustments and decrease in number of permits issued.

(Footnotes continue on the following page.)

(Footnotes continued from prior page.)

(7) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to increased interest rates for earnings for cash with Fiscal Agent and City Treasury, and accrual reversal of prior year unrealized loss for investments in City Treasury.
(8) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to increase in full-time equivalent and average pay, and pension expenses based on actuarial reports.
(9) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to increased construction contracts.
(10) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 mainly due to water treatment supplies.
(11) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to pending depreciation schedules.
(12) Decrease between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 mainly due to decreased water assessment fees paid to Hetchy Water.
(13) Increase between Fiscal Years 2022-23 and 2023-24 due to accrual reversal of prior year claim, increase in legal fees and litigation expenses.
(14) Represents adjustment to show investing activities annualized on a cash basis.
(15) Changes in working capital represents adjustments to reconcile operating income to net cash provided by operating activities from the Statements of Cash Flows in the audited financial statements. Fiscal Year 2022-23 and Fiscal Year 2023-24 adjustments primarily driven by adjustments relating to receivables, accounts payable pension obligations, OPEB, the Balancing Account for Wholesale Customers, damage claims liability and other liabilities.
(16) Net revenues for the year ended June 30, 2024 include appropriated available funds. Such amount offsets Operating and Maintenance Expenses in Current Basis calculations.
(17) "Net Revenue" is presented on a cash basis. Refundable Credits actually received by the SFPUC are reflected as reductions in Bond Debt Service and are excluded from Net Revenue. Prior to January 9, 2020, due to federal sequestration, the Indenture required that Refundable Credits not be reflected as reductions in Bond Debt Service but rather permitted an adjustment to Net Revenue; however, an amendment to the Indenture that allows for Refundable Credits actually received by the SFPUC to be reflected as reductions in Bond Debt Service and excluded from Net Revenue went into effect on January 9, 2020.
(18) Per Indenture, in addition to current year cash flow, coverage calculation includes certain "Other Available Funds," which are not budgeted to be spent in such twelve months and legally available to pay debt service.
(19) Coverage does not include debt service on subordinate obligations, including the Water Enterprise's share of lease payments associated with the 2009 Golden Gate COPs and debt service on Commercial Paper Notes.
(20) Unaudited. Calculated as ratio between Net Revenues over debt service on all senior lien obligations; excludes "Other Available Funds."

Source: SFPUC; compiled from the SFPUC's audited financial statements for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2022-23.
Note: Totals may not add due to rounding,

PROJECTED OPERATING RESULTS

The following table presents projected operating results for the Water Enterprise. These projections are based on an analysis of historical trends, adjusted where appropriate for known or anticipated changes in operations. The projections are also based on the assumption that all retail water rate increases necessary to finance the Water Enterprise's capital improvement program will be approved and implemented. The projections in the following Table 26 are budget based. Therefore, line items in Table 26 will not correspond to similar line items in Table 25, which is based upon the SFPUC's GAAP financial statements for the Water Enterprise.

THESE PROJECTIONS, ALL OR SOME OF WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT BE REALIZED, ARE BASED ON THE ISSUANCE OF ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS FOR WATER ENTERPRISE CAPITAL PROJECTS AND HETCH HETCHY PROJECTS AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED. CHANGES IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT FORM THE BASES FOR THE ASSUMPTIONS USED IN DEVELOPING THESE PROJECTIONS, AS WELL AS UNANTICIPATED EVENTS, MAY OCCUR SUBSEQUENT TO THE DATE OF THIS OFFICIAL STATEMENT. THEREFORE, ACTUAL RESULTS MAY DIFFER MATERIALLY FROM THE PROJECTIONS SHOWN.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

TABLE 26
PROJECTED REVENUES, OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSES AND DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30[*]
(IN THOUSANDS)

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
CURRENT REVENUE					
Retail Revenues[(1)]	$343,243	$362,837	$390,454	$420,783	$453,903
Wholesale Revenues[(2)]	356,128	375,797	388,987	396,467	420,932
Other Miscellaneous Income[(3)]	40,651	37,539	35,948	36,474	39,259
Total Current Revenues	$740,022	$776,174	$815,389	$853,724	$914,094
OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSE[(4)]	$363,548	$357,873	$368,557	$381,559	$394,491
less **FUND BALANCES BUDGETED & APPROPRIATED**[(5)]	(24,011)	(39,137)	0	(1,509)	0
NET OPERATING REVENUE[(6)]	$400,485	$457,437	$446,832	$473,673	$519,604
plus **AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE**[(7)]	172,426	138,309	138,345	136,836	149,768
FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEBT SERVICE	$572,911	$595,746	$585,176	$610,509	$669,372
DEBT SERVICE[(8)]	$317,448	$366,151	$372,302	$381,513	$422,598
less BABs Interest Subsidy Payments[(6)]	(20,370)	(19,876)	(19,345)	(18,772)	(18,164)
NET DEBT SERVICE	$297,079	$346,275	$352,957	$362,741	$404,434
DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE[(9)]					
Indenture Basis[(6)(10)]	1.93x	1.72x	1.66x	1.68x	1.66x
Sufficiency of Revenues[(6)(11)]	1.35x	1.32x	1.27x	1.31x	1.28x

[*] Projections are based on the SFPUC's most recent two-year operating budget for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, adopted by Commission in February 2024 and subsequent changes approved by the Commission in February 2025. Revenue forecasts have been updated to include Commission-approved wholesale water rates for Fiscal Years 2025-26 and revised volume forecasts.

(1) Assumes projected average daily billed retail consumption of 53.9 mgd, 54.3 mgd, 54.0 mgd, 53.7 mgd, and 53.8 mgd for Fiscal Years 2024-25, 2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28 and 2028-29, respectively. Assumes an average annual retail rate increase of 5.0% for Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26 and an average rate increase of 8.0% in Fiscal Years 2026-27 through 2028-29. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue."

(2) Assumes projected average daily billed wholesale consumption of 127.7 mgd, 131.7 mgd, 136.6 mgd, 137.0 mgd and 138.1 mgd for Fiscal Years 2024-25, 2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28 and 2028-29, respectively. Assumes an 8.8% wholesale rate increase for Fiscal Year 2024-25, a wholesale rate increase of 2.3% in Fiscal Year 2025-26, and an average annual rate increase of 2.3% in Fiscal Years 2026-27 through 2028-29. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue."

(3) Includes, among other amounts, projected interest income, property rentals, fees, cost recoveries, and service installation charges.

(4) Represents Operating and Maintenance Expense net of depreciation and other non-cash items per Indenture. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS" and "APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE."

(5) The SFPUC budgeted and appropriated available fund balances to be used as a source of funds as follows: $24.011 million in Fiscal Year 2024-25, $39.137 million in Fiscal Year 2025-26, and $1.509 million in Fiscal Year 2027-28. Such amounts offset Operating and Maintenance Expenses in sufficiency of Revenues calculations.

(6) Refundable Credits received by the SFPUC pursuant to its Build America Bonds are treated as a reduction in projected Debt Service and are not included in projected Net Revenues. Refundable Credits expected to be received assume a sequestration rate of 5.7%. Sequestration rates are subject to change and may be increased by federal legislation. The 2010B Bonds and the 2010E Bonds, issued as Build America Bonds, will be refunded by the 2025F Bonds, which will eliminate a portion of the Refundable Credits received by the SFPUC. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

(7) Amounts are treated as Revenues under the Indenture. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS."

(8) Consists of debt service on Outstanding Bonds (net of capitalized interest), projected debt service for two existing Parity State Loans, and projected debt service for the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds and anticipated Additional Series of Bonds. Fiscal Year 2024-25 Debt Service net of approximately $12.6 million in contributed funds for the issuance of the SFPUC's San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series ABC; these funds consisted of interest funds of the respective refunded bonds used to fully or partially defease Fiscal Year 2024-25 Debt Service. See "– *Projected Debt Service Assumptions*."

(9) Coverage does not include debt service on subordinate obligations, including the Water Enterprise's share of lease payments associated with the 2009 Golden Gate COPs and debt service on Commercial Paper Notes or Revolving Notes.

(10) Calculated as the sum of Net Operating Revenue and certain available fund balances of the Water Enterprise, divided by Annual Debt Service. The Indenture includes a rate covenant of 1.25 times coverage. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants – *Debt Service Coverage*."

(11) Calculated as ratio between Net Operating Revenue over debt service on all senior lien obligations; excludes "Available Fund Balance."

Source: SFPUC.

Notes: Amounts set forth in the table are projections. Actual results may differ materially from these projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS." Totals may not add due to rounding,

In the preparation of the projections set forth in the table above, the SFPUC has made certain assumptions with respect to conditions that may occur in the future. While the SFPUC believes these assumptions are reasonable for the purpose of the projections, they are dependent on future events, and actual conditions are likely to differ, perhaps materially, from those assumed. To the extent actual future conditions differ from those assumed by the SFPUC or provided to the SFPUC by others, actual results will vary from those projected. This projected information has not been compiled, reviewed or examined by the SFPUC's independent auditors.

The assumptions used in the table above include the following:

Projected Revenue Assumptions. Projections reflect approved retail rate increases of 5.0% in Fiscal Years 2024-25 and 2025-26, as approved by the Commission on May 23, 2023 (see "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue – *Retail Water Rate Adjustments*"), and assume an average annual retail rate increase of 8.0% in Fiscal Years 2026-27 through 2028-29.

Revenues from sales of water to the Wholesale Customers are calculated in accordance with the WSA. The projections assume a wholesale rate increase of 8.8% in Fiscal Year 2024-25 and an average annual wholesale rate increase of 2.3% in Fiscal Years 2025-26 through 2028-29. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue – *Wholesale Water Rate Adjustments*."

In addition, interest earnings assume average annual yields of 2.0% throughout the projected period.

"Available Fund Balance" amounts are treated as "Revenues" for purposes of "Debt Service Coverage – Indenture Basis."

"BABs Subsidy Payments" are treated as a reduction in projected Debt Service and are not included in projected Net Revenues. See also "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants – *Debt Service Coverage*."

Projected Operating Expense Assumptions. Operating and Maintenance Expenses of the Water Enterprise are projected to increase at an average annual rate of 2.0% per year from Fiscal Year 2024-25 through Fiscal Year 2028-29.

Projected Debt Service Assumptions. Projected debt service consists of projected, not actual, debt service on the 2010B Bonds, the 2010E Bonds and the 2010G Bonds (net of anticipated Refundable Credits), the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2016 Series AB, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2016 Series C, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2017 Series DEFG, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2019 Series ABC, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2020 Series ABCD, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2020 Series EFGH, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2023 Series ABCD Bonds, the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series ABC, the 2025D Bonds and the 2025E Bonds (net of capitalized interest), two existing Parity State Loans (see "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans"), and anticipated Additional Series of Bonds (net of capitalized interest). Projected debt service does not reflect the refunding of the Refunded Bonds and, therefore, does not include projected debt service on the 2025F Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

Following the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, the SFPUC anticipates that it will issue approximately $1.08 billion of Additional Series of Bonds in Fiscal Year 2026-27 to fund Water Enterprise capital projects.

The projected debt service for the 2025D Bonds and 2025E Bonds and each Additional Series of Bonds assumes a borrowing rate of 6.0%, no Bond Reserve Account and up to two years of capitalized interest.

The actual issuance dates, borrowing rates and capitalized interest periods may vary from these assumptions. The SFPUC may also issue refunding bonds from time to time in response to market conditions in order to achieve debt service savings. See "FINANCING OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS."

RISK FACTORS

This section provides a general overview of certain risk factors which should be considered, in addition to the other matters set forth in this Official Statement, in evaluating an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds. This section is not meant to be a comprehensive or definitive discussion of all of the risks associated with an investment in the 2025DEF Bonds. The order in which this information is presented does not necessarily reflect the relative importance of various risks or the probability of their occurrence.

Potential investors in the 2025DEF Bonds are advised to consider the following factors, among others, and to review this entire Official Statement to obtain information essential to the making of an informed investment decision. Any one or more of the risk factors discussed below, among others, could lead to a decrease in the market price and/or in the marketability of the 2025DEF Bonds or adversely affect the ability of the SFPUC to make timely payments of principal of or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds. There can be no assurance that other risk factors not discussed herein will not become material in the future and the SFPUC has not undertaken to update investors about the emergence of the risk factors in the future.

General

The ability of the SFPUC to comply with its covenants under the Indenture and to generate Revenues sufficient to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds may be adversely affected by actions and events outside of the control of the SFPUC and may be adversely affected by actions taken (or not taken) by voters, property owners, taxpayers or persons obligated to pay fees and charges. Among other matters, drought, general and local economic conditions and changes in law and government regulations could adversely affect the amount of Revenues realized by the SFPUC or significantly raise the cost of operating the Water Enterprise.

In addition, the realization of future Revenues is subject to, among other things, the capabilities of management of the SFPUC, the ability of the SFPUC to provide service to its Retail Customers and the wholesale customers, the ability of the SFPUC to establish, maintain and collect charges from its Retail Customers and the wholesale customers and the ability of the SFPUC to establish, maintain and collect rates and charges sufficient to pay for Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise, the Bonds and other obligations payable from Revenues. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS" and "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES."

Bond Payment Risks

Limited Obligation. If the SFPUC defaults on its obligations to make debt service payments on the Bonds, the Trustee has the right under the Indenture to accelerate the total unpaid principal amount of the Bonds. However, in the event of a default and such acceleration, there can be no assurance that the SFPUC, and correspondingly the Trustee, will have sufficient moneys available for payment of the Bonds.

The SFPUC is not obligated to pay the principal of, or premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds except from Revenues of the Water Enterprise. The SFPUC has no taxing power. The General Fund of the City is not liable for the payment of the principal of, or premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City is pledged to the payment of the principal of, or premium, if any, or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds. The 2025DEF Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any property of the City or of the SFPUC or any of its income or receipts, except Revenues.

No Bond Reserve Account. No Bond Reserve Account has been established for the 2025DEF Bonds. The Bond Reserve Accounts established with respect to other Series of Bonds do not secure the 2025DEF Bonds. Therefore, the only security pledged to the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds are the Revenues pledged under the Indenture and the covenant of the SFPUC to impose rates and charges necessary to pay debt service on the 2025DEF Bonds.

Limitations on Remedies. The remedies available to the Owners of the 2025DEF Bonds upon the occurrence of an event of default under the Indenture in many respects depend upon judicial actions which are themselves often

subject to discretion and delay and could prove both expensive and time consuming to obtain. In addition to the limitations on remedies contained in the Indenture, the rights and obligations under the 2025DEF Bonds and the Indenture may be subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, arrangement, fraudulent conveyance, moratorium and other laws relating to or affecting creditors' rights, to the application of equitable principles, to the exercise of judicial discretion in appropriate cases and to limitations on legal remedies against charter cities and counties in California.

The opinion to be delivered by Bond Counsel, concurrently with the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, that the 2025DEF Bonds constitute valid and binding limited obligations of the SFPUC, and the Indenture constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the SFPUC, will also be subject to such limitations. The various other legal opinions to be delivered concurrently with the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds will be similarly qualified. See "APPENDIX D – PROPOSED FORMS OF OPINIONS OF BOND COUNSEL."

If the SFPUC fails to comply with its covenants under the Indenture or to pay principal of or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds, there can be no assurance that the available legal remedies will be adequate to protect the interests of the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds.

Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations

The operation of the Water Enterprise, and the physical condition of the Water Enterprise facilities, are subject to a number of risk factors that could adversely affect the reliability of the SFPUC's water supply, or increase the operating expenses of the Water Enterprise. Prolonged damage to the Water Enterprise facilities could interrupt the ability of the SFPUC to realize Revenues sufficient to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds, or require the SFPUC to increase expenditures for repairs significantly enough to adversely impact the SFPUC's ability to pay the principal of or interest on the Bonds. These factors could include, among others, the following.

Failure of Water Facilities. Many of the Water Enterprise's facilities have been in service for an extended period and may be near or have reached the end of their useful lives. See "WATER FACILITIES – Physical Condition of Certain Facilities" and "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES."

Seismic Hazards. The Water Enterprise's distribution, treatment and transmission systems and some of the facilities of the Hetch Hetchy Project are located in seismically active regions of California, and cross three major known active fault zones (the San Andreas Fault, the Hayward Fault and the Calaveras Fault). See "WATER FACILITIES – Seismic Hazards."

Natural and Man-Made Disasters. Other natural disasters, including without limitation, wildfires, flooding, landslides, or man-made disasters or accidents, including without limitation, water pipeline failures, natural gas pipeline failures or explosions, could interrupt operation of the Hetch Hetchy Project or the Regional Water System, result in liability claims against the Water Enterprise, or otherwise adversely impact the Water Enterprise's ability to provide services or collect Revenues. With respect to wildfires specifically, see "WATER FACILITIES – Wildfire Considerations."

Casualty Losses. The SFPUC's risk management program includes both self-insured and insured coverages; however, the program does not provide coverage for every conceivable risk of loss. Damage attributable to seismic events and environmental pollution, for example, are excluded. In situations where the SFPUC has not purchased commercial coverage, the Water Enterprise has a "self-retention" program that it administers and retains budgeted resources internally to provide coverage for loss liabilities. See also "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Risk Management and Insurance." The SFPUC is not required to either insure against or self-insure against every potential risk of loss, and there is a risk that damage or destruction of property and equipment comprising the Water Enterprise could occur for which no insurance or self-insurance funds will be available. There can be no assurance that insurance providers will pay claims under any policies promptly, or at all, should a claim be made under such policies in connection with property loss or damage. It is possible that an insurance provider will refuse to pay a claim, especially if it is substantial, and force the SFPUC to sue to collect on or settle the insurance claim. Further, there can be no assurances that any insurance proceeds will be sufficient to rebuild or replace any damaged property.

The SFPUC is authorized under the WSA to adopt emergency rate increases which helps to mitigate this risk. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue – *Wholesale Water Rate Adjustments*."

Insurance Coverage. The SFPUC believes it maintains a comprehensive risk management program. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Risk Management and Insurance." However, like other utilities, the SFPUC is susceptible to fluctuations in the insurance market. Any adverse impacts to the insurance market relating to wildfires or other natural disasters could lead to higher costs or prohibitively expensive coverage, or limited or unavailable coverage for certain types of risk, which may have an adverse effect on the SFPUC's financial condition.

Drought. California is located in a semi-arid region and is subject to periodic drought. An extended drought could adversely affect the ability of the SFPUC to deliver water sufficient to satisfy all of the demands of its customers. If the SFPUC were to deliver less water to its customers, the SFPUC would need to increase the rates payable by customers or Revenues would decline. The SFPUC may also seek to acquire, and would be obligated to pay the cost of, additional water to deliver to its customers. The SFPUC has adopted a drought planning sequence and associated operating procedures respecting the delivery of water during a drought. The SFPUC is authorized under the WSA to adopt drought surcharges if needed. In addition, retail water rates and charges for the three-year period effective July 1, 2023, include a drought surcharge. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue – *Retail Water Rate Adjustments*." See also "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Water Supply Reliability and Drought Planning."

Wet Years. Precipitation within the Water Enterprise service area varies from year to year. High levels of precipitation generally result in reduced water usage for irrigation, reducing the amount of water delivered by the SFPUC. If the SFPUC were to deliver less water to its customers, the SFPUC would need to increase the rates payable by customers or Revenues would decline. High levels of precipitation may also increase the supply of water available to wholesale customers, also reducing SFPUC water deliveries. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Current Water Conditions."

Climate Change. Climate change could have a significant impact on State water supplies and on the operations of the Regional Water System and the Water Enterprise. See "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Climate Change."

Safety and Security. The occurrence of military conflicts and terrorist activities may adversely impact the operations of the SFPUC, including the Water Enterprise, and/or the finances of the SFPUC. The SFPUC continually plans and prepares for emergency situations. See "WATER FACILITIES – Safety and Security." However, there can be no assurance that any existing or additional safety and security measures will prove adequate in the event that military conflicts or terrorist activities are directed against the assets of the Water Enterprise or that costs of security measures will not be greater than presently anticipated.

Cybersecurity. Unauthorized access to the SFPUC's technology or infrastructure networks could expose information assets and cause significant damage and disruption to the SFPUC's operations and the provision of SFPUC services. Although the SFPUC has several cybersecurity measures and safeguards in place, there can be no assurance that any existing or additional safety and security measures will prove adequate if military conflicts or terrorist activities, including cyber terrorism, or acts of malfeasance are directed against the assets of the Water Enterprise or the SFPUC's technology systems. The costs of remedying any such damage or protecting against future attacks could be substantial. Further, cybersecurity breaches could expose the SFPUC to litigation and other legal risks, which could cause the SFPUC to incur significant costs related to such legal claims or proceedings. For more information regarding the SFPUC's cybersecurity measures, see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Cybersecurity."

Statutory and Regulatory Compliance. The operation of the Water Enterprise is subject to a variety of federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements concerning matters such as water quality, dam safety, instream fishery flows and endangered species. The SFPUC's failure to comply with applicable laws and regulations could result in significant fines and penalties. In addition to claims by private parties, changes in the scope and standards for public agency water systems such as the Water Enterprise may also lead to administrative orders issued by federal or State regulators. Future compliance with such orders could also impose substantial additional operating expenses on the Water Enterprise. See "REGULATORY MATTERS."

Endangered Species. Various aquatic species (including native fish) present in the Tuolumne River and Bay Area streams (*e.g.*, Alameda, San Mateo and Pilarcitos Creeks) are either listed or candidates for listing under the State or federal endangered species acts. New listings and future enforcement actions under the acts, or conditions placed in permits to undertake construction for certain projects, could potentially directly affect water flow and/or water supplies available to the Water Enterprise and/or increase costs due to mitigation requirements. See "REGULATORY MATTERS – Endangered Species."

Labor Actions. A work stoppage or other labor action could limit the SFPUC's ability to operate the Water facilities and adversely impact Revenues. See "THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION – Employee Relations – *San Francisco*."

Construction Related Risks. Construction projects in the Water Enterprise's capital program are subject to ordinary construction risks and delays applicable to projects of their kind, including but not limited to (i) inclement weather affecting contractor performance and timeliness of completion, which could affect the costs and availability of, or delivery schedule for, equipment, components, materials, labor or subcontractors; (ii) contractor claims or nonperformance; (iii) failure of contractors to execute within contract price; (iv) work stoppages or slowdowns; (v) failure of contractors to meet schedule terms; (vi) supply chain issues; (vii) errors or omissions in contract documents requiring change orders; (viii) the occurrence of a major seismic event, pandemic, or other natural or man-made disaster; or (ix) unanticipated project site conditions, including the discovery of hazardous materials on the site or other issues regarding compliance with applicable environmental standards, and other natural hazards or seismic events encountered during construction. In addition, Water Enterprise construction projects may require scheduling system and facility shutdowns to avoid impacting water deliveries and many shutdown windows are inflexible or need to be modified to meet changing conditions. Increased construction costs or delays for any reason in connection with the Water Enterprise's capital program could impact the Water Enterprise's financial condition in general and the implementation of its capital programs in particular.

Proposals to Restore Hetch Hetchy Valley. Some environmental organizations advocate for the removal of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and the restoration of Hetch Hetchy Valley. For example, an initiative ordinance qualified for the November 2012 City ballot with support from an organization called "Restore Hetch Hetchy" and would have required the City to identify alternative sources of water and, subject to certain additional conditions, end its use of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. This initiative was rejected by San Francisco voters.

Previous studies have examined proposals to remove Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. For example, a 2006 report by the California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Parks and Recreation concluded that it is technically feasible to restore Hetch Hetchy Valley but cautioned financial feasibility. The study estimated that the total cost of such a project would range from $3 billion to $10 billion in 2006 (approximately $4 billion to $13 billion in 2020, adjusted for inflation). The State agencies also concluded that the initial planning effort would take up to 10 years to complete and cost an additional $65 million.

In 2015, Restore Hetch Hetchy filed a complaint against the City alleging that the SFPUC's operation of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir is an unreasonable method of diversion of water in violation of the State Constitution because of the O'Shaughnessy Dam's location within a national park. The case has been fully and finally resolved in the City's favor. In addition, in 2019, Restore Hetch Hetchy commissioned a report that concluded that restoring Hetch Hetchy Valley and opening it to greater public use had an economic use value between $2 billion to $5 billion and an intrinsic passive-use value of over $100 billion over a 50-year period. No formal federal, State or local policy proposals have been made in response to the report.

In addition to proposals for the removal of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and the restoration of Hetch Hetchy Valley, there is a proposal to expand access to Hetch Hetchy Reservoir for recreational purposes, which could possibly lead to filtration requirements of water derived from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir.

The SFPUC is unable to predict whether any similar initiatives, or similar federal or State legislation, might be approved by the voters or adopted by legislative bodies in the future, or the potential impact of such efforts on the SFPUC or the Water Enterprise. Any such legislation or litigation, if successful, could impose substantial additional operating and capital expenses on the Water Enterprise.

Risks Relating to Financial Operations

Limitations on Rate Setting. The generation of Revenues sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Indenture and to pay the principal of and interest on the Bonds will require the SFPUC to raise the water rates payable by its customers. The increase or maintenance of retail water rates is subject to various substantive and procedural requirements and limitations. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue" and "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS."

Water rates payable by the Wholesale Customers are established under the WSA, which may help reduce the risk that Revenues will be insufficient for the purposes described in this section. Rates established pursuant to the WSA are subject to the substantive requirements and the procedures, including procedures for resolving disputes, of applicable law and as set forth in the WSA. The WSA also provides for rate adjustments for drought and non-drought emergencies if needed. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Wholesale Water Sales Revenue" and "APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT."

Increased Operating and Maintenance Expenses. There can be no assurance that the Operating and Maintenance expenses of the SFPUC, such as wages and salaries, pension and other benefits, and purchased power costs, will not increase, perhaps substantially. See "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Operating and Maintenance Expenses."

Interim Funding Program Facilities. The bank credit facilities supporting the Commercial Paper Notes are subject to early termination upon the occurrence of certain events, including the failure of the SFPUC to make certain payments, the occurrence of certain bankruptcy or insolvency-related events, the reduction below specified levels or the withdrawal or suspension of ratings on certain obligations of the SFPUC payable from Revenues or certain other specified events of default. Upon the occurrence of such termination, one or more of the following would likely occur: (a) the SFPUC would be prohibited from issuing additional notes supported by such credit facilities; (b) any outstanding reimbursement obligation of the SFPUC to the bank providing such facility for draws made for the payment of principal of or interest on Commercial Paper Notes could bear interest at rates higher than the rates borne by the Commercial Paper Notes; and (c) any such outstanding reimbursement obligation of the SFPUC could be accelerated and become immediately due and payable. The Commercial Paper Notes and any reimbursement obligations are payable from Revenues on a basis subordinate to the Bonds.

The commitment of the banks to make advances under the revolving credit agreements for interim funding (the repayment obligation of the SFPUC for which are evidenced by the Revolving Notes) may be terminated by the banks upon the occurrence of certain events, including the failure of the SFPUC to make certain payments, the occurrence of certain bankruptcy or insolvency-related events, the reduction below specified levels or the withdrawal or suspension of ratings on certain obligations of the SFPUC payable from Revenues or certain other specified events of defaults. Upon such an event of default, (a) the outstanding repayment obligation of the SFPUC evidenced by the Revolving Notes would bear interest at substantially increased interest rates and (b) the banks could declare all amounts outstanding under the Revolving Notes to be immediately due and payable. The Revolving Notes are secured on a basis subordinate to the payment of debt service on the Bonds.

See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Subordinate Debt and Interim Funding Program."

Inverse Condemnation. Under the doctrine of inverse condemnation (a legal concept that entitles property owners to just compensation if their private property is damaged by a public use), California courts have imposed liability on public agencies in legal actions brought by private property holders for damages caused by such public agencies' infrastructure. In *City of Oroville v. Superior Court of Butte County*, 7 Cal. 5th 1091 (2019), however, the California Supreme Court held that damage to private property must be substantially caused by an inherent risk presented by the deliberate design, construction or maintenance of the public improvement. Thus, if the inherent risks associated with the SFPUC's facilities, including water storage or transportation facilities or electrical distribution and transmission lines, as deliberately designed, constructed or maintained, are determined to be the substantial cause of damage to private property from flooding, fire or otherwise, and the doctrine of inverse condemnation applies, the SFPUC could be liable for direct and indirect property damage to private parties and such liability, in the aggregate, could be substantial. In addition to such claims for property damage, the SFPUC could also be liable under other

theories of liability, including if the SFPUC were found to have acted unreasonably or to have been negligent, which liability, in the aggregate, could be substantial. See "WATER FACILITIES – Wildfire Considerations."

Bankruptcy Risk

Bankruptcy or Financial Failure of Wholesale Customers. The financial failure or bankruptcy of a Wholesale Customer could adversely affect the ability of such Wholesale Customer to honor its obligation under the WSA (including its obligation to pay the purchase price of water delivered by the SFPUC to such Wholesale Customer).

The SFPUC is not aware of the existing or impending financial failure or bankruptcy of any Wholesale Customer, but there can be no assurance that a financial failure or bankruptcy of a Wholesale Customer will not occur. If a Wholesale Customer were to become bankrupt, the SFPUC may be unable to enforce the terms of the WSA against such Wholesale Customer and the SFPUC's right to receive payment for water delivered prior to bankruptcy but not invoiced or invoiced but not paid may be limited to the rights of an unsecured creditor of the bankrupt entity. Further, there can be no assurance that the SFPUC will be physically able or legally permitted to cease or interrupt deliveries of water to a non-paying Wholesale Customer.

Although no assurance can be provided, the SFPUC believes that any reduction in Revenues as a result of the inability to collect payment for water delivered to a bankrupt Wholesale Customer or as a result of any temporary interruption or reduction of water deliveries will not be material. The SFPUC further believes that, following such bankruptcy, the amount of water delivered for the service area currently served by such Wholesale Customer will not be reduced and that the SFPUC will be able to obtain payment for such water on terms comparable to the terms of the WSA.

Bankruptcy of the City. The SFPUC, being an enterprise department of the City, likely cannot itself file for bankruptcy. While an involuntary bankruptcy petition cannot be filed against the City, the City is only authorized to file for bankruptcy under certain circumstances. Should the City file for bankruptcy, there could be adverse effects on the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds.

To the extent that Revenues are "special revenues" under the United States Bankruptcy Code (the "**Bankruptcy Code**"), the Revenues collected after the date of the bankruptcy filing should be subject to the lien of the Indenture. If any or all of the Revenues are determined not to be "special revenues," then any such amounts collected after the commencement of the bankruptcy case will likely not be subject to the lien of the Indenture. "Special revenues" are defined to include revenues derived from the ownership or operation of projects or systems that are primarily used to provide utility services. No assurance can be given that a court would hold that any or all Revenues are special revenues. In a case arising from the insolvency proceedings of Puerto Rico, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit concluded that while a debtor has the right to voluntarily apply special revenues to the payment of debt service during the pendency of a bankruptcy case, the debtor is not obligated to do so, even though the special revenues are subject to the lien of the bond documents. The holders of the 2025DEF Bonds may not be able to assert a claim against any property of the City other than the Net Revenues, and if any or all of the Revenues are no longer subject to the lien of the Indenture, then there may be limited, if any, funds from which the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds are entitled to be paid.

The Bankruptcy Code provides that "special revenues" can be applied to necessary operating expenses of the project or system, before they are applied to other obligations. This rule applies regardless of the provisions of the transaction documents. It is not clear precisely which expenses would constitute necessary operating expenses, and any definition in the transaction documents may not be applicable.

If the City is in bankruptcy, the parties (including the Trustee and the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds) may be prohibited from taking any action to collect any amount from the City or to enforce any obligation of the City, unless the permission of the bankruptcy court is obtained. These restrictions may also prevent the Trustee from making payments to the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds from funds in the Trustee's possession. The rate covenants (see "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants") may not be enforceable in bankruptcy by the Trustee or the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds.

Revenues are deposited with and held by the City Treasurer and may be commingled with other City funds. See "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Flow of Funds." If the City is in bankruptcy, the City may not be required to turn over to the Trustee any Revenues that are in its possession at the time of the bankruptcy filing or come into its possession after the bankruptcy filing. In addition, if the City has possession of Revenues (whether collected before or after commencement of the bankruptcy) and if the City does not voluntarily turn over such Revenues to the Trustee, it is not entirely clear what procedures the Trustee and the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds would have to follow to attempt to obtain possession of such Revenues, how much time it would take for such procedures to be completed, or whether such procedures would ultimately be successful. The United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, in another case involving the insolvency proceedings of Puerto Rico, concluded that a bankruptcy court does not have the power to order a debtor such as the City to comply with state law.

The City may be able to borrow additional money that is secured by a lien on any of its property (including the Revenues), which lien could have priority over the lien of the Indenture, or to cause some of the Revenues to be released to it, free and clear of the lien of the Indenture, in each case as long as the bankruptcy court determines that the rights of the Trustee and the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds will be adequately protected.

If the City is in bankruptcy, it may be able, without the consent and over the objection of the Trustee and the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds, to alter the priority, interest rate, principal amount, payment terms, collateral, maturity dates, payment sources, covenants (including tax-related covenants and the rate covenant), and other terms or provisions of the Indenture and the 2025DEF Bonds, as long as the bankruptcy court determines that the alterations are fair and equitable.

There may be delays in payments on the 2025DEF Bonds while the court considers any of these issues. There may be other possible effects of a bankruptcy of the City that could result in delays or reductions in payments on the 2025DEF Bonds, or result in losses to the holders of the 2025DEF Bonds. Regardless of any specific adverse determinations in a City bankruptcy proceeding, the fact of a City bankruptcy proceeding could have an adverse effect on the liquidity and value of the 2025DEF Bonds.

Other Risks

Federal Policy Risks. Federal policies involving taxation, appropriations, borrowing (including the debt ceiling), trade (including tariffs), immigration, climate change, clean energy and other topics can shift, sometimes dramatically, from one presidential administration or Congress to another. From time to time, such shifts can result in reductions to the level of federal funding for a variety of policy priorities, including transportation, housing, healthcare, social services and other federally funded programs. Recently, several such policy shifts, including delays in grants and other appropriations, have been proposed or promulgated through presidential executive orders and other official and unofficial actions at the federal level. The SFPUC cannot predict the outcome of such proposals and other actions, nor the potential impacts of any future such changes in federal policy. However, such changes could in the future have adverse effects on revenues, operation and maintenance costs or capital funding requirements.

The SFPUC depends on the work of various federal agencies to conduct its operations. For example, the SFPUC relies, in part, on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("**NOAA**"), which includes the National Weather Service, for information regarding daily weather forecasts, severe storm warnings, climate monitoring, and long-term climate projections. The SFPUC also relies on the USEPA for regulatory compliance guidance, water quality standards and testing protocols, infrastructure funding through various federal funding programs, and support during environmental emergencies. In addition, the SFPUC relies on the National Park Service to manage Yosemite National Park, where the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and substantial portions of the SFPUC's Regional Water System infrastructure are located, including watershed protection, facility maintenance access, and security. Recently, the federal government has begun conducting large-scale layoffs across federal agencies, including but not limited to layoffs at NOAA, the USEPA and the National Park Service. The SFPUC cannot predict the potential impacts of such layoffs; however, such actions could have adverse effects on the SFPUC's operations.

Federal Legislation. Legislation is periodically introduced in the U.S. Congress that could affect the finances or operations of the SFPUC. Examples of federal legislative proposals that could have an adverse effect on the SFPUC if they were to be introduced and become law include, but are not limited to limitations on the amount or availability of tax-exempt financing under Section 103 of the Code or elimination of the exclusion of interest on tax-exempt bonds

from gross income for all or some taxpayers. Legislative proposals to eliminate or limit the benefit of tax-exempt interest on bonds such as the 2025DEF Bonds have been made in the past, may currently be under consideration, and may be made again in the future. If adopted, any such proposal could alter the federal tax treatment described under the heading "TAX MATTERS" or could adversely affect the market value or marketability of the 2025DEF Bonds. The SFPUC cannot predict whether any such legislation will be introduced or enacted in the current or future sessions of the U.S. Congress.

Economic, Political, Social and Environmental Conditions. Changes in economic political, social, or environmental conditions on a local, State, federal, and/or international level may adversely affect investment risk generally. Such conditional changes may include (but are not limited to) fluctuations in business productivity, consumer prices, or financial markets, unemployment rates, availability of skilled labor, technological advancements, shortages or surpluses in natural resources or energy supplies, changes in law, social unrest, fluctuations in the crime rate, political conflict, acts of war or terrorism, environmental damage, and natural disasters.

Pandemics; COVID-19 Pandemic. A pandemic, epidemic or outbreak of an infectious disease can have significant adverse health and financial impacts on global and local economies. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted the City and resulted in prolonged stay-at-home orders that impacted each of the SFPUC's enterprises, including the Water Enterprise. In addition to certain direct impacts on the Water Enterprise. COVID-19 had significant and varied impacts on general economic activity at the local, national and global levels, including supply chain and labor market disruptions that resulted in increases in costs across a wide number of sectors, as well as delays in delivery of projects and equipment. The Water Enterprise experienced, and may in the future experience, increases in certain costs and delays and disruptions to the delivery of capital projects. See also "– Risks Related to Water Enterprise Facilities and Operations – *Construction Related Risks*."

Initiative, Referendum, Charter Amendments and Future Legislation. Under the State Constitution, California voters have the ability to initiate legislation and require a public vote on legislation passed by the State Legislature through the powers of initiative and referendum, respectively. The SFPUC is unable to predict whether any such initiatives might be submitted to or approved by the voters, the nature of such initiatives, or their potential impact on the SFPUC or the Water Enterprise. See "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS."

Under the Charter, the San Francisco voters can restrict or revise the powers of the SFPUC through the approval of a Charter amendment or other initiative. For example, in June 1998, San Francisco voters approved Proposition H which included a limited exception to raise rates to pay debt service on voter-approved debt, froze the SFPUC's water and sewer rates through July 1, 2006. The SFPUC can give no assurance that the electorate will not seek in the future to freeze or limit rate increases. See "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS – Charter Limitations."

In addition, the SFPUC is subject to various laws, rules and regulations adopted by the local, State and federal governments and their agencies. The SFPUC is unable to predict the adoption or amendment of any such laws, rules or regulations, or their effect on the operations or financial condition of the SFPUC.

Loss of Tax Exemption/Risk of Tax Audit of Municipal Issuers. As discussed under "TAX MATTERS," interest on the 2025DEF Bonds could fail to be excluded from the gross income of the owners thereof for purposes of federal income taxation retroactive to the date of the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds as a result of future acts or omissions of the SFPUC in violation of its covenants to comply with requirements of the Code. Should such an event of taxability occur, the 2025DEF Bonds are not subject to redemption or any increase in interest rate and could remain outstanding until maturity.

The Internal Revenue Service (the "**IRS**") has an expanded program for the auditing of tax-exempt obligations, including both random and targeted audits. It is possible that the 2025DEF Bonds could be selected for audit by the IRS. It is also possible that the market value of the 2025DEF Bonds might be affected as a result of such an audit of the 2025DEF Bonds (or by an audit of similar securities).

Failure to Maintain Credit Ratings. Certain rating agencies have assigned ratings to the 2025DEF Bonds. The ratings issued reflect only the views of such rating agencies. Any explanation of the significance of these ratings should be obtained from the respective rating agencies. See "RATINGS." There is no assurance current ratings will continue for any given period or that such ratings will not be revised downward or withdrawn entirely by the rating agencies if, in the respective judgment of such rating agencies, circumstances so warrant. Any such downward revision or withdrawal of such ratings could be expected to have an adverse effect on the market price or the marketing of the 2025DEF Bonds. The SFPUC undertakes no obligation to maintain its current credit ratings on the 2025DEF Bonds or to oppose any such downward revision, suspension or withdrawal.

Secondary Market. There can be no guarantee that there will be a secondary market for the 2025DEF Bonds or, if a secondary market exists, that the 2025DEF Bonds can be sold for any particular price. Occasionally, because of general market conditions or because of adverse history or economic prospects connected with a particular issue, secondary marketing practices in connection with a particular issue are suspended or terminated. Additionally, prices of issues for which a market is being made will depend upon then prevailing circumstances. Such prices could be substantially different from the original purchase price.

Uncertainties of Projections, Forecasts and Assumptions. Certain information contained in this Official Statement is based upon assumptions and projections. Projections and assumptions are inherently subject to significant uncertainties. Inevitably, some assumptions will not be realized and unanticipated events and circumstances may occur and actual results are likely to differ, perhaps materially, from those projected. Accordingly, such projections are not necessarily indicative of future performance, and the SFPUC assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of such projections. See "FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS."

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

REGULATORY MATTERS

General

Public water supply systems in California, such as the Regional Water System and In-City Distribution System operated by the Water Enterprise, are primarily regulated by the SWRCB Division of Drinking Water ("**DDW**"), formerly under the California Department of Public Health ("**CDPH**") and, in some limited instances, by the USEPA and California Regional Water Quality Control Boards ("**RWQCBs**").

Drinking water delivered to customers must comply with statutory and regulatory water quality standards designed to protect public health that are now administered by DDW. The CDPH reissued a drinking water supply permit in 2004 prescribing conditions and requirements for the Water Enterprise to specifically operate the Regional Water System. The CDPH also issued drinking water supply permits to the In-City Distribution System, several small water systems owned and operated by the Water Enterprise, and the wholesale customer public water supply systems. The CDPH and the DDW issued several amendments to the Regional Water System and In-City Distribution System permits for various changes over the last 20 years. In accordance with the drinking water standards and permit requirements, the Water Enterprise operates and maintains water storage, treatment and conveyance facilities, implements watershed management and protection activities, performs inspections, monitors drinking water quality, conducts applied research, maintains and implements a comprehensive and effective cross-connection control program, and submits monthly and annual compliance reports. The Water Enterprise is currently operating in compliance with all State and federal drinking water regulations and permit requirements. The drinking water supply permits for both Regional Water System and In-City Distribution System are scheduled to be updated around 2030 to reflect new facilities and operations.

In addition, public water system discharges to State and federal waters are regulated under general National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("**NPDES**") permits. The SWRCB issues general permits, whereas the two RWQCBs (San Francisco Bay and Central Valley) issue individual region-specific NPDES permits to the SFPUC, which contain numerical effluent limitations, monitoring, reporting and notification requirements for water discharges from the facilities and pipelines of the Regional Water System. The SFPUC is generally operating and maintaining the water treatment and transmission facilities in compliance with the NPDES permit requirements. Coverage under existing NPDES permits will remain since the permits issued by the SWRCB or RWQCBs are either reissued on a specific timeline or administratively extended. The SFPUC will ensure continuous coverage and re-enroll under NPDES permits as necessary.

A number of water resource management and regulatory initiatives may affect the availability of water to the Regional Water System in the future. Also, alternate water supplies currently used by wholesale customers of the Water Enterprise may be reduced in the future, increasing the customers' reliance on the Regional Water System. In addition to those raised below, these initiatives include the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009, the federal or California Endangered Species Acts, the SWRCB Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan amendment proceedings, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("**FERC**") proceeding to relicense the Irrigation Districts' Don Pedro Hydropower Project sited on its New Don Pedro Dam and Reservoir and others. The effects of any of these activities, or of these activities cumulatively, are unknown.

Drinking Water Requirements

Regulatory Agency. The USEPA and the DDW have picked up their pace updating existing and adopting new drinking water regulations. These new developments will impact the current operations of the SFPUC's drinking water systems as new resources may be needed to comply with these new and/or updated regulatory requirements.

Recent Adoption of Drinking Water Regulations. The DDW has adopted many new drinking water regulations at the State level in the last five years. These include a primary maximum contaminant level ("**MCL**") for hexavalent chromium; direct potable reuse regulations; cross-connection control policy; a much lower detection limit, from 6 to 1 microgram per liter ("**µg/L**"), for reporting of perchlorate level in drinking water; the Total Coliform Rule Revision; a policy handbook for monitoring of microplastics in drinking water; and notification and response level for per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances ("**PFAS**"). In the last five years, the USEPA adopted two drinking water regulations consisting of MCLs and Hazard Index for six PFAS contaminants (including PFOS, PFOA, PFBS, PFHxS

and two others), the Lead and Copper Rule Revision ("**LCRR**") and the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements ("**LCRI**"), and Consumer Confidence Report Revision regulations. On May 14, 2025, the USEPA announced it will keep the MCLs for PFOS and PFOA, but intends to rescind the Hazard Index for PFBS, PFHxS, and two other PFAs chemicals. The USEPA also anticipates proposing revisions to microbial and disinfection byproduct rules in summer 2025.

Near-Term Regulatory Development. Several regulatory developments at the State level are anticipated in the near future, including but not limited to the following: revision of the existing Lead and Copper Rule ("**LCR**") in line with the corresponding federal LCRR and LCRI; increase in publication frequency of a Consumer Confidence Report from annual to semiannual to conform to the recently adopted federal Consumer Confidence Report Revision regulations; adoption of new MCLs for PFOS and PFAS; adoption of notification levels and response levels related to harmful algal bloom, PFAS, and manganese, and lowering detection limits for reporting purposes for eight metals including lead, nickel and arsenic. At the federal level, the USEPA has committed to issuing a drinking water regulation for setting perchlorate MCL by May 2027, and is in the process of developing the stage 3 microbial/disinfection byproduct regulation.

Regulatory Review by USEPA and DDW. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act ("**SDWA**"), the USEPA must review all existing regulations every six years and determine which regulations may need to be revised. The fourth Six-Year Review of existing National Primary Drinking Water Regulations was completed in July 2024, and the USEPA determined that there are no additional candidates identified for regulatory revision. However, the Six-Year Review is not a final regulatory decision to revise or not revise a drinking water regulation; rather, it is part of a pre-planning process to determine if a rulemaking effort to revise the regulation should be considered.

Similarly, California Health and Safety Code §116365(g) requires the DDW to review its MCLs at least once every five years. These quinquennial MCL reviews are to ensure that the drinking water standards cannot be less stringent than the corresponding federal values and must be as close as is technically and economically feasible to the public health goals established by the California Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment ("**OEHHA**"). The latest review was conducted between 2015 and 2017 and concluded by the SWRCB in 2018 that no MCL revisions were needed. Nevertheless, regulatory changes resulting in the need for new infrastructure and operations may incur in future MCL reviews by USEPA and DDW with respect to the following existing drinking water regulations:

Surface Water Treatment. Several related regulations addressing surface water treatment requirements for drinking water were adopted by the USEPA and the DDW between 1990 and 2010. These regulations, including the Surface Water Treatment Rule, Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment, Filter Backwash Recycling Rule, Long-Term 1 and Long-Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rules, require filtration of all surface water supplies unless the water supply can meet certain stringent requirements. These regulations also impose microbial disinfection/inactivation performance with which community water systems including those operated by the SFPUC have to comply.

As discussed under "WATER FACILITIES – Water Treatment," the high quality of water stored at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir has been determined to be sufficient to meet filtration avoidance requirements without installation and operation of filtration facilities. However, new treatment (disinfection or filtration) facilities could be required in the future if the filtration avoidance criteria are not consistently met or due to changes in these regulations. See "*– Regulatory Review by USEPA and DDW*."

Local water from the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds and upcountry non-Hetch Hetchy sources requires filtration to meet applicable drinking water quality requirements. The filtered and treated water from these non-Hetch Hetchy sources are typically blended with the disinfected Hetch Hetchy water. Most customers receive water from blended sources. The SFPUC's Tesla Treatment Facility uses ultraviolet light technology to inactivate target organisms (*Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*) in the Hetch Hetchy water supply; it has been performing well since its operations began in 2012. See "WATER FACILITIES – Water Treatment."

System water quality, including both raw water and treated water, is continuously monitored and tested year-round to assure that water delivered to customers meets or exceeds federal and State drinking water/public health

requirements. Nevertheless, more rigorous water quality monitoring efforts may be required as a result of new or updated drinking water regulations that are adopted by USEPA and/or DDW.

Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproduct Rule. The USEPA promulgated the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule ("**Stage 2 DBPR**") in 2006 and the State adopted its version of the same rule in 2012. This rule is to reduce public health risk associated with disinfection byproducts ("**DBPs**") in drinking water. Since then, the SFPUC has demonstrated compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR by the continued use of the chloramination treatment process.

Under the SDWA Six-Year Review Rule, USEPA decided to review existing disinfectant and disinfection byproduct rules. The USEPA anticipates proposing revisions to microbial and disinfection byproduct rules in summer 2025.

Groundwater Rule. The USEPA promulgated the Groundwater Rule ("**GWR**") to address waterborne disease and microbial contamination related to groundwater. The DDW adopted its own version of the GWR in 2011 by reference to the USEPA's regulations. The GWR requires that a system putting new groundwater sources in service must conduct assessment source-water monitoring if directed by the State. The GWR also requires a groundwater system to conduct triggered source-water monitoring if it does not provide 4-log virus treatment and the results of bacteriological monitoring are fecal-coliform positive. The SFPUC presently has a groundwater program consisting of two projects: San Francisco Groundwater Supply for the In-City Distribution, and Groundwater Storage and Recovery for the Regional Water System. The groundwater wells of these two projects will serve as the additional and emergency water supplies to the In-City Distribution System and the Regional Water System. The requirements of this rule are applicable to these two groundwater systems, and the extent of impacts depends on the operational management and water quality of these new alternate groundwater sources. Additional treatment facilities may be required to meet the disinfection requirements and to reduce certain mineral content of the groundwater to comply with the corresponding drinking water standards, if water quality monitoring results indicated such a need and the approved blending treatment with the surface water sources is insufficient to meet the existing and/or future drinking water standards.

Revised Total Coliform Rule. The USEPA adopted the Revised Total Coliform Rule ("**RTCR**") in 2013 and the DDW adopted its own version of the RTCR that has been effective since July 1, 2021. Both the Regional Water System and the In-City Distribution System are in compliance with these regulatory requirements. The USEPA is in the process of developing a new rule regulating the operations of distribution systems and storage facilities of all community water system in the nearest future. It is too early at this time to identify what new treatment facilities or operational changes will be required to meet this future rule.

Lead and Copper Rule. The SFPUC proactively addressed the issue of lead in water well before the USEPA published its Lead and Copper Rule in 1991 and the State's adoption of similar regulations in the 1990s. The federal LCR was subsequently updated with several regulatory actions that resulted in the promulgation of 2000 LCR Minor Revisions, 2007 LCR Short-Term Revisions, 2021 LCRR, and 2024 LCRI.

In the 1980s, the SFPUC removed all known lead service lines and fittings from the In-City Distribution System. In the late 1990s, the SFPUC started distributing non-lead faucets to daycare centers and schools. The distribution program for non-lead faucets was then expanded to the general public served by the In-City Distribution System. In the 2000s, the SFPUC initiated a program to replace service meters with a non-leaded type in the In-City Distribution System and eliminated large, leaded, compound meters. At the present time, approximately 99% of the service meters have been replaced.

In 2006, the SFPUC submitted a report to the State documenting that its existing corrosion control treatment using pH adjustment was optimized. The SFPUC also piloted use of other non-leaded plumbing components and sponsored the lead-free law known as Assembly Bill 1953 ("**AB 1953**") that was enacted by the California Legislature in 2006. AB 1953, which requires new lead-free plumbing components containing no more than 0.25% lead, has been in effect since January 1, 2010. In January 2014, the USEPA began enforcing its lead-free mandate known as the Reduction of Lead in Drinking Water Act, which was enacted by Congress on January 4, 2011. The USEPA's definition of "lead free" is the same as that in AB 1953.

In 2024, the SFPUC completed its last triennial LCR monitoring for the In-City Distribution and the Regional Water System in accordance with the 1991 LCR. The monitoring results demonstrate continued compliance with the existing LCR. Nevertheless, the SFPUC may have to conduct a new optimized corrosion control treatment study if, in the future, the SFPUC decides to blend new groundwater sources into the Regional Water System and the In-City Distribution System. The next round of LCR monitoring must be performed in accordance with the new LCRI requirements. Two rounds of full monitoring must be completed in 2028 before reduced triennial monitoring can be requested with the DDW and USEPA. If lead levels exceed the new lower threshold, the SFPUC must notify the public and may need to modify its corrosion control treatment.

In 2016, Section 116885 of the California Health and Safety Code was amended by Senate Bill 1398 and Senate Bill 427 requiring a community water system, such as those overseen by the SFPUC, to complete the following: (i) compile an inventory of known Lead User Service Lines ("**LUSLs**"), which are utility-owned service lines that have components made of lead material, by July 1, 2018; (ii) identify areas that may have LUSLs, including service lines made of unknown materials, by July 1, 2018; (iii) identify unknown user service line material by July 1, 2020; and (iv) develop a replacement timeline for LUSLs and still unknown material user service lines by July 1, 2020. The approved SFPUC replacement timeline is 10 years. The 2026 Capital Plan includes the As-Needed Water Service Line Replacement Project (also known as the Lead Component Services Program), estimated to cost $38.5 million, and funding to complete this work. The SFPUC has also applied for an additional State Revolving Fund loan to finance the project. See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Parity State Loans." This project is 73% complete and expected to be completed by June 2026, years ahead of the compliance deadline.

In January 2021, the LCRR went into effect. As part of the Biden administration's review of all new regulations, the USEPA reviewed the LCRR and decided in 2021 to keep the lead service line inventory requirements of the LCRR in place to ensure the initial customer water service line material inventory was completed by October 2024. The LCRI revised several facets of the LCRR, including lowering the 90th percentile lead action level from 15 µg/L to 10 µg/L, revising tap sampling procedures, deferring free lead sampling at schools and licensed childcare centers to 2027, and imposing a 10-year deadline for water systems to conduct replacements for all lead-containing service lines within the SFPUC's control. The DDW is also in the process of updating its own version of the LCR so that its regulatory requirements will be at least consistent with the LCRR. The SFPUC has performed inspections and used statistical methods to prepare the initial lead service line inventory, identifying 653 customer-owned galvanized service lines that were previously downstream of a utility-owned lead service line, and 407 service lines with unknown lead status. No lead service lines were found. The SFPUC expects to be able to identify the material composition of service lines with unknown lead status before 2027; otherwise, these customer-owned services lines will need to be replaced within a 10-year period. The replacement cost is currently unknown.

PFAS. The USEPA adopted primary MCLs for six PFAS on April 10, 2024. On April 5, 2024, the OEHHA adopted public health goals for PFOA and PFOS at 0.007 ng/L and 1 ng/L, respectively, for California. The State law requires a MCL established by the DDW to be as close to its public health goals as is technologically and economically feasible.

The In-City Distribution System and the Regional Water System also completed four rounds of quarterly sampling of 29 PFAS components and lithium in early 2024. This monitoring was required under USEPA's fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule ("**UCMR5**"). The sampling results gathered throughout the United States under UCMR5 will be used by USEPA in its future determination of rulemaking needs regarding these 30 contaminants. The SFPUC's PFAS and lithium monitoring results confirmed no detection of these 30 contaminants in the drinking water. The only SFPUC location with detection below regulatory limits has been the small Pleasanton Well Field Water System, which is a standalone water system independent of the Regional Water System and the In-City Distribution System.

The City Attorney's Office has repeatedly opted out of settlement agreements to preserve its rights to seek better compensation if an issue related to PFAS contamination in the SFPUC water sources were to develop in the future. In addition, on March 3, 2025, the San Francisco City Attorney filed a lawsuit on behalf of the People of the State of California in San Francisco Superior Court against certain PFAS manufacturers seeking to recover abatement and damages for contamination of San Francisco's resources. The lawsuit alleges that at least two drinking water wells operated by the SFPUC as part of the Pleasanton Well Field Water System have detectable levels of PFAS. The lawsuit also alleges PFAS contamination in the City's other resources, including the City's combined sewer collection system.

While the City believes that the claims in this lawsuit are meritorious, it can give no assurance regarding whether the lawsuit will be successful and obtain the requested relief from the courts, or contributions to the abatement fund from the defendant PFAS manufacturers.

Fluoridation. The 1995 State Assembly Bill 733 requires large water systems to fluoridate their public water supply and directs the appropriate State agency to seek funding for fluoridation. The State adopted its fluoridation regulation in 1998. The requirements of this regulation, as codified in Section 64433 through 64434 of Title 22, California Code of Regulations, apply to large water systems with at least 10,000 service connections.

The SFPUC has been fluoridating its water supply since the early 1950s, and meets all the requirements of fluoridation regulation. In 2015, the United States Department of Health and Human Services Agency recommended that water systems practicing fluoridation adjust their fluoride content to 0.7 mg/L, as opposed to the previous temperature-dependent optimal levels ranging from 0.7 mg/L to 1.2 mg/L. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (the "**CDC**") also provided detailed information on the basis for this change. To reflect the CDC's recommendation, the DDW consulted with public water systems practicing fluoridation regarding amendments to their individual public water supply permits to reference the CDC's recommended optimal level of 0.7 mg/L. The DDW confirmed in 2016 that the fluoride control range for the Regional Water System is 0.6 mg/L to 1.2 mg/L in addition to the recommended optimal level. The SFPUC is in compliance with the prescribed levels and the operational and monitoring requirements of the State fluoridation regulation.

Cross-Connection Control. On December 19, 2023, the DDW adopted a policy handbook that replaces the regulations in Title 17 of California Code of Regulations for cross-connection control. Effective starting on July 1, 2024, the policy handbook establishes enforceable standards and provides guiding principles to California public water systems for public health protection through backflow prevention and control of cross-connection. On December 10, 2024, the SFPUC amended Section G, Cross-Connection Control, of its Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers, to be consistent with the handbook's new standards. While the handbook has established requirements with which the SFPUC is in compliance through its cross-connection control program, its financial impacts to the Water Enterprise's operations are uncertain since these requirements were recently put into effect. Ongoing review of the program implementation will need to be conducted. The SFPUC will submit a Cross Connection Control Plan to DDW by July 1, 2025, as required by the handbook.

Direct Potable Reuse. On August 6, 2024, the Office of Administrative Law approved the DDW's regulations on direct potable reuse, which establishes enforceable requirements of water recycling through raw water augmentation for drinking water supply. The SFPUC will not develop new direct potable reuse supplies for some time. Operational costs and impacts will be identified during project design.

Hexavalent Chromium MCL. The DDW adopted an updated hexavalent chromium MCL of 10 µg/L with a much lower detection limit for reporting purposes at 0.1 µg/L. The new MCL regulation was approved by Office of Administrative Law in July 2024 and went into effect on October 1, 2024. With the State's new reporting limit, there were occasions in 2024 when the treated water from the two local treatment plants had low detections of this contaminant. While treatment of the SFPUC's surface water is not anticipated as the detections are far below the MCL, the groundwater sources, which have substantially higher hexavalent chromium levels, will continue to be treated using the DDW-approved blending method to meet the MCL.

Regulations/Other Contaminants. The DDW has also initiated the rulemaking process for the following MCLs on its priority agenda: N-nitroso-dimethylamine ("**NDMA**"), perfluorooctanoic acid ("**PFOA**"), and perfluorooctane sulfonic acid. ("**PFOS**"), as well as the review process for possible revisions to a suite of contaminants that have existing primary MCLs. Among these contaminants, arsenic is a primary candidate to be reviewed. DDW is expected to continue increasing its efforts with the ultimate goal of establishing applicable drinking water standards, either new or more stringent, to enhance public health protection. These DDW regulations may have unknown impacts to the SFPUC's water operations, dependent on the values of these future MCLs and the improvements in water quality analytical technology.

The DDW is also considering the following: acute and short-term notification and response levels for four cyanotoxins (microcystins, cylindrospermopsin, anatoxin-α, and saxitoxin) recommended by the OEHHA; and lower

notification and response levels for manganese at 20 µg/L and 200 µg/L, respectively (existing levels are 500 µg/L and 5,000 µg/L, respectively).

Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program Regulations. In 2020, the SWRCB adopted new Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program ("**ELAP**") regulations, which are applicable to five laboratories within the Water Enterprise's Water Quality Division. While most regulations took effect January 1, 2021, full compliance was required by January 1, 2024. All ELAP-accredited laboratories have successfully completed third-party assessments and demonstrated compliance with the new regulations, which incorporate TNI Standards based on ISO 17025. The SFPUC is currently designing a new laboratory facility in Millbrae to replace the existing 50-year-old facility. The SFPUC continues to maintain and operate its laboratories in accordance with all regulatory standards and plans for future laboratory improvements as needed.

Public Water System Discharges

As part of routine operations and maintenance activities, the SFPUC transfers treated water between storage facilities and discharges water to the environment. These transfers and discharges are regulated under the federal Clean Water Act through general NPDES permits issued by the SWRCB or RWQCB, as appropriate.

The SFPUC currently has several NPDES permits that cover discharges from the Regional Water System and SFPUC drinking water facilities. These permits generally impose discharge limitations, monitoring, reporting, and notification requirements. These permits require the SFPUC to control various water quality parameters (such as pH, chlorine residual, turbidity, etc.) and implement best management practices to minimize any adverse environmental effects caused by the discharges from the Regional Water System.

On March 4, 2025, the City prevailed in its action against the USEPA regarding an NPDES discharge permit issued under the Clean Water Act for the Wastewater Enterprise's Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant. The dispute centered on "end-result" provisions – permit terms that made the City responsible for water quality in the Pacific Ocean – well beyond the quality of the City's discharges. In *City and County of San Francisco v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 604 U.S. __ (2025), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Clean Water Act does not authorize the USEPA to impose "end-result" provisions in its discharge permits. The Supreme Court's decision requires the USEPA to follow the Clean Water Act by establishing clear permit requirements that prevent pollution by restricting discharges before those discharges reach receiving waters. The decision does not relieve the SFPUC of its Clean Water Act responsibilities, but the USEPA's "end-result" requirements could have resulted in the SFPUC having to incur significant, unknowable capital costs, adversely impacting the SFPUC's ability to achieve its affordability goals. See also "FINANCIAL OPERATIONS – Retail Water Sales Revenue – *Affordability*."

Bay Delta Water Quality Standards

The Water Enterprise obtains the majority of its Bay Area water supply from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, located on the main branch of the Tuolumne River, which is an upstream tributary to the Lower San Joaquin River and the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary (the "**Bay Delta**").

In 2009, the SWRCB noticed its intent to update water quality objectives of the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary and the program of implementation, which had the potential to result in impacts to water rights and the issuance of water quality regulations consistent with the program of implementation. Following a several years-long process, in 2018, the SWRCB adopted the "Phase 1" Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan ("**2018 Plan Amendment**") and the accompanying final Substitute Environmental Document. The adopted 2018 Plan Amendment was developed with the stated goal of increasing salmonid populations in three San Joaquin River tributaries (the Stanislaus, Merced, and Tuolumne Rivers) and the Bay-Delta. The 2018 Plan Amendment requires the release of 40% (by default, but may be variable between 30% and 50%) of the "unimpaired flow" on the three San Joaquin River tributaries from February through June in every water year type, whether wet, above normal, dry, or critically dry. If the 2018 Plan Amendment were to be implemented, it would result in significant water supply shortages for the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System during single dry and multiple dry years.

The SWRCB has three primary means of implementing the 40% unimpaired flow requirement: (1) in a separate water rights proceeding that would consider any necessary changes to upstream water rights; (2) by adopting a regulation and issuing orders on targeted water rights; or (3) through Clean Water Act section 401 certification actions in FERC hydroelectric licensing processes, such as the FERC relicensing proceeding underway for the Don Pedro Project on the Tuolumne River (see "– FERC Proceeding to Increase Flows in the Lower Tuolumne River" below).

In 2019, the City joined in filing a lawsuit with the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority challenging the SWRCB's adoption of the 2018 Plan Amendment on multiple legal grounds including the California Environmental Quality Act and the Porter Cologne Act. Over a dozen other lawsuits have been filed in State and federal court challenging the 2018 Plan Amendment. Through 2021 and 2022, the Sacramento County Superior Court has issued a series of rulings in favor of the State against a number of petitioners, which has led to the dismissal without leave to amend of several causes of action, and upholding other causes of action. On March 15, 2024, the Superior Court issued a final order on the merits, denying all claims raised by all petitioners and ruling in favor of the SWRCB on all issues raised. On May 15, 2024, the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority and nine other petitioners appealed the decision of the Superior Court; these appeals were consolidated. These consolidated appeals remain pending and have not yet reached the briefing stage.

The 2018 Plan Amendment further directed the SWRCB to develop biological goals, or targets, to explain the expected outcomes of the implementation of the 2018 Plan Amendment and to inform the SWRCB's exercise of the adaptive management provisions of the 2018 Plan Amendment. In July 2023, the SWRCB issued a draft Biological Goals document. Commenters, including the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority, raised concerns that the biological goals the SWRCB developed were unrelated to, and would not be attainable through, the implementation of the 2018 Plan Amendments. In September 6, 2023, the SWRCB adopted the Biological Goals without resolving many of the concerns that the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority and other parties raised. On February 6, 2024, the SWRCB re-adopted the Biological Goals without substantive change but with the addition of new CEQA findings. On October 6, 2023 and March 5, 2024, respectively, the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority filed suit challenging the SWRCB's two actions adopting the Biological Goals, alleging violations of the California Environmental Quality Act and the California Administrative Procedure Act, among others. These lawsuits remain pending and have not reached the merits stage.

When the SWRCB approved the 2018 Plan Amendment, it also directed staff to compile a Delta watershed-wide agreement, including potential flow measures for the Tuolumne River, and to incorporate such agreements as an alternative for a future amendment to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan to be presented to the SWRCB as early as possible after December 1, 2019. On March 1, 2019, in accordance with the SWRCB's instruction, the SFPUC, in partnership with the Modesto Irrigation District and Turlock Irrigation District (collectively, the "**Tuolumne Parties**"), submitted to the State a proposed voluntary agreement ("**Tuolumne Voluntary Agreement**"). A memorandum of understanding to advance the Tuolumne Voluntary Agreement was signed by the Tuolumne Parties in November 2022. In spring 2023, the Tuolumne Parties and other public water agencies completed necessary draft terms and agreements and submitted them to the SWRCB for review. The public water agencies also renamed the "Voluntary Agreements" to the "Healthy Rivers and Landscapes" ("**HR&L**") program. The SWRCB conducted a series of workshops in 2023 and 2024 to publicly review the Sacramento portion of the HRL&L program. The SWRCB expects to consider the Tuolumne portion of the HR&L program for adoption in 2026. The SWRCB process will include (1) scientific peer review of the Tuolumne HR&L program, and (2) release of a draft CEQA document for public comment and a final CEQA document. After a final CEQA document is issued, the SWRCB would then be able to consider adoption of the Tuolumne HR&L program. If successful, this process may allow the SFPUC to offset some of the flow requirement of the 2018 Plan Amendments by agreeing to instead implement certain "non-flow" measures designed to improve the viability of targeted fish species. These negotiations remain ongoing.

In addition, in 2019 and 2020, the State and other parties filed multiple lawsuits against the federal government for its adoption of biological opinions that altered how the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation would operate the Central Valley Project. In December 2024, the Bureau of Reclamation issued a record of decision reversing the record of decision issued in 2020. In 2020, several other lawsuits were filed against the State for its issuance and adoption of an incidental take permit governing how the California Department of Water Resources would operate the State Water Project. While the City is not participating in these lawsuits, this litigation may continue to impact negotiations for a Delta watershed-wide agreement.

FERC Proceeding to Increase Flows in the Lower Tuolumne River

FERC licenses the Don Pedro Hydropower Project ("**Don Pedro Project**"), owned and operated by the Irrigation Districts. The City helped fund the original construction of Don Pedro Project in exchange for a 570,000 acre-foot "water bank" account allowing the SFPUC to receive water credits for advanced releases from the Hetch Hetchy Project to the New Don Pedro Reservoir, and to debit from this water bank by diverting water otherwise allocated to the Irrigation Districts.

The current FERC license for the Don Pedro Project expired in 2016, and the Irrigation Districts are now operating under an annual license that incorporates the conditions of their prior license. The Irrigation Districts initiated the process to relicense the Don Pedro Project using FERC's Integrated Licensing Process in 2010. Relicensing is a lengthy process, stretching over several years and open to public participation. It is estimated the process may cost up to $50 million to complete, which costs are split for certain studies between the Irrigation Districts and the SFPUC pursuant to an existing agreement. The Irrigation Districts submitted an Amended Final License Application ("**AFLA**") for the Don Pedro Project on October 11, 2017.

The Irrigation Districts are also working through an initial licensing proceeding for the La Grange Diversion Dam (the "**La Grange Project**"), which is located on the Tuolumne River, two miles downstream of the Don Pedro Project. The Irrigation Districts also submitted their Final License Application ("**FLA**") for the La Grange Project on October 11, 2017. The City has no legal or contractual responsibilities regarding the ownership or operation of the La Grange Project and is not subject to the licensing conditions for the La Grange Project.

NEPA and CEQA environmental review must be completed before licenses can be issued. On July 7, 2020, FERC released the Final Environmental Impact Statement ("**FEIS**") for both the AFLA for the Don Pedro Project and the FLA for the La Grange Project. The Irrigation Districts are in the process of conducting CEQA review. The FEIS presents a "staff recommendation" that is mostly aligned with the Irrigation Districts' AFLA.

As described in the "Bay Delta Water Quality Standards" section above, under section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act, FERC cannot issue a new license for a hydroelectric project until a state's water quality agency issues a certification stating that the new license will comply with the applicable water quality requirements (the "**401 Certification**") or, alternatively, FERC determines that the state has waived its authority to issue a 401 Certification. The ongoing WQCP voluntary agreement process is designed, in part, to draft the terms of the 401 Certification that would be included as part of the FERC license in lieu of the 40% unimpaired flow requirement set forth in the 2018 Plan Amendment. However, in January 2021, the SWRCB issued a final 401 Certification that sets a flow schedule more onerous than the 2018 Plan Amendment. The SFPUC and the Irrigation Districts filed petitions for reconsideration at the SWRCB in February 2021. The SWRCB did not timely respond to these petitions and the City and the Irrigation Districts consequently filed related lawsuits challenging the 401 Certification. On May 7, 2024, the SWRCB unilaterally set aside the 401 Certification, and, on August 13, 2024, the court entered the stipulated dismissal-without-prejudice of the City's and the Irrigation Districts' lawsuits. In addition, the Irrigation Districts challenged FERC to find that the SWRCB has waived its authority to issue a 401 Certification. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit decided the Irrigation Districts' waiver lawsuit unfavorably to the Irrigation Districts, and, in April 2023, the United States Supreme Court denied the Irrigation Districts' petition for certiorari, fully resolving this case. On December 15, 2024, the Irrigation Districts re-applied for a section 401 Certification, and that process remains ongoing.

A 1995 Don Pedro Project Settlement Agreement ("**Settlement Agreement**") and a 1996 Order by FERC ("**1996 Order**") established increased water flows on the Tuolumne River to protect fisheries and riparian resources. A restoration plan ("**Restoration Plan**") adopted in 2000 guides planning, funding and implementation efforts. The Restoration Plan calls for a series of projects with a combined estimated cost of $25 million to improve river channel, riparian, and fisheries conditions within a 27-mile stretch of the Tuolumne River corridor below the La Grange Diversion Dam. Four of the ten priority projects were completed with available State and federal funding. More recently, the City and the Irrigation Districts as well as other non-governmental organizations have been working on implementing additional habitat restoration projects related to the Restoration Plan.

Pursuant to a 1966 agreement between the City and the Irrigation Districts, the City might have been liable to provide a portion of the increased flows mandated under the 1995 Settlement Agreement. Instead, the City and the

Irrigation Districts entered into a new agreement (the "**Side Agreement**") whereby the Irrigation Districts agreed to provide all flows ordered by FERC to implement the Settlement Agreement until FERC issues a new license for the Don Pedro Project in exchange for which the City pays the Irrigation Districts $3.5 million per year, subject to an escalation clause applied to keep pace with inflation. Pursuant to the terms of its agreement with the Irrigation Districts, the City may withdraw from the agreement upon one year's notice.

The term of the Side Agreement runs until FERC issues a new license for the Don Pedro Project. License conditions, such as water-release requirements, could change under a new license. Changed release requirements could adversely affect the availability of Tuolumne River water to the SFPUC and hydroelectric generation. To prevent these potentially adverse effects to its operations on the Tuolumne River, the SFPUC is seeking to extend the existing Side Agreement so that it would remain in effect after the Don Pedro Project FERC license is renewed.

FERC has not yet provided a schedule for relicensing. However, it is expected that the National Marine Fisheries Service will first exercise its Endangered Species Act section 7 consultation authority before FERC moves forward with license approval. The National Marine Fisheries Service has not indicated when it will commence this consultation process.

Dam Licensing and Safety Issues

In 1929, the California Legislature enacted legislation providing for supervision over non-federal dams in the State. The statutes place the supervision of the safety of non-federal dams and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the DSOD. Dams under DSOD jurisdiction are artificial barriers, together with appurtenant work, including outlet towers, which are 25 feet or more in height or have an impounding capacity of 50 acre-feet or more. Any artificial barrier not in excess of six feet in height, regardless of storage, or that has a capacity not in excess of 15 acre-feet, regardless of height, is not considered within DSOD's jurisdiction.

The DSOD reviews plans and specifications for the construction of new dams or for the enlargement, alteration, repair or removal of existing dams, under applications, and must grant written approval before the owner can proceed with construction. The DSOD routinely inspects operating dams to ensure that they are adequately maintained. The DSOD also conducts investigations of selected dams and directs the owners to additional investigations and detailed safety evaluations when necessary. In 2017, Oroville Dam, which is owned and operated by the State, suffered significant spillway structural problems and a major downstream area was temporarily evacuated. As a result of the Oroville Dam spillway problems, the State Legislature enacted legislation to enhance the DSOD's authority; pursuant to such authority, the DSOD has requested additional evaluations of certain spillways, including spillways at the following four dams: Cherry Valley, O'Shaughnessy, Turner, and San Andreas.

SFPUC Dam and Safety Resiliency Program. The SFPUC has 18 dams under the jurisdiction of the DSOD. In 2019, the SFPUC performed a comprehensive overview of evaluations and potential capital improvements that may be needed for these dams in the following 15 years. The SFPUC created a proposed schedule for improvement projects for 15 of the dams and submitted the schedule to the DSOD in 2020. Several new projects were added to the Capital Plan over time to address these needs. In 2024, an updated letter was sent to DSOD sharing progress on the evaluations and capital projects for 15 of the dams. In most cases, additional evaluations are being conducted to further determine capital needs as part of each project's planning phase. Thus, while estimated funding has been included in the 2026 Capital Plan for these facility improvements, the scopes, budgets and schedules may be adjusted in future years as more information becomes available.

In December 2023, the SFPUC submitted a pre-application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a CWIFP loan to finance a collection of eight Water Enterprise projects supporting dam safety and resilience. In September 2024, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers notified the SFPUC that its pre-application was selected to submit a full application for CWIFP financing consideration for a loan up to $614,811,376. The SFPUC plans to submit the full application prior to the deadline of September 9, 2025. For more information regarding the CWIFP loan, see "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Corps Water Infrastructure Financing Program."

Capital improvement projects for SFPUC's dams that are currently funded under the 2026 Capital Plan are described below:

O'Shaughnessy Dam. O'Shaughnessy Dam was completed in 1923 and raised in 1938. Most of the outlet facilities were installed when the dam was first built in 1923. These outlet facilities have exceeded their design life and need rehabilitation or replacement to maintain their reliability and functionality. The O'Shaughnessy Dam Outlet Works Project will extend the service life and reliable operation of the 100-year-old outlet system. The rehabilitation work is divided into two phases. The scope of Phase 1 includes replacing the access platforms in ladder wells, clearing critical drainage systems within the dam, building a new bulkhead system as a safe isolation for upcoming rehabilitation of gates and valves, replacing the instream flow release valves, and pre-construction planning of drum gates and slide gates replacement. The value of construction work for Phase 1 is estimated to be over $30 million dollars. Phase 1 construction has started with anticipated construction completion in 2026. The objective of Phase 2 is to rehabilitate slide gates, drum gates, large valves such as the 60-inch and 72-inch diameter needle valves, diversion tunnel and diversion pipeline, and associated control systems. The value of construction work for Phase 2 is estimated to be over $90 million dollars. The planning of Phase 2 will start in 2025, with staggered construction starting in 2030 and anticipated construction completion in 2041. The current estimated total project cost (which includes planning, bid and award, and close out costs, as well as construction costs) is $44 million for Phase 1 and $184 million for Phase 2.

Lake Eleanor Dam. Lake Eleanor Dam is a multiple arch reinforced concrete dam with roadway bridge at the crest that was constructed in 1918. Due to the age of the dam, some of the structural elements including the bridge and concrete barrels exhibit various degrees of deterioration including cracking and spalling of concrete, exposed rebar, leakage through the arch barrels, and cracks and erosion of the spillway concrete. The bridge is at the top of the dam and is an integral structure of the dam, providing the only vehicle and personnel access to the spillway structure and the other side of the dam for maintenance purposes. In addition, the dam's spillway is inadequate to pass the updated inflow design flood. The Lake Eleanor Dam Rehabilitation Project will address concerns with concrete deterioration and spill capacity of the existing dam concrete structure, and first, rehabilitate the bridge, then subsequently replace the bridge deck when overall dam improvements are constructed. The project's first phase, the bridge rehabilitation project, is in the final design phase with anticipated construction completion in 2027 and an estimated construction cost of about $4 million. The second phase of the project will address dam improvements including concrete deficiencies, increased capacity for releases, and increased downstream erosion protection. Planning for this second phase is funded to start in 2025, with anticipated construction completion in 2037. The estimated total project cost for both phases of improvements to the bridge and dam is $114 million.

Priest Dam. The Priest Dam Condition Assessment and Monitoring Project includes a geotechnical exploration of the dam, a stability analysis, and a complete Condition Assessment Report. Additionally, the project will install new instrumentation to monitor the dam's performance. Pre-construction work (review of files, records, and site visits) started in 2022 with the geotechnical investigation commencing in 2024 due to the need to coordinate with the Mountain Tunnel Project shutdowns. Construction work has been completed and the Condition Assessment Report is currently in progress. The estimated project cost is $1.5-2.5 million. Pending the results from the Priest Dam Condition Assessment in 2025-2026, it is expected that a Priest Dam rehabilitation project may be developed in the future to correct potential deficiencies.

Cherry Valley Dam. Cherry Valley Dam was built in 1955. The spillway includes a 334-foot wide ogee-type concrete weir that discharges into an unlined adjacent channel. Engineering studies showed that remedial measures and erosion protection for the spill channel are needed to ensure that spill flows from Cherry Valley Dam spillway can be contained without erosion damage to the existing embankment dam and downstream area. Studies also found that long-term improvement to the spillway is needed to increase the hydraulic capacity of the spillway to safely pass the updated inflow design flood. The 2026 Capital Plan includes Cherry Dam Spillway Short-Term Improvements project as a short-term interim solution until a project for long-term spillway improvements can be implemented. The dam's original design documents indicate that the spillway is rated for 52,000 cubic feet per second ("**cfs**"). However, significant erosion damage occurred below the dam in 2010 when corresponding spillway releases were less than 1,800 cfs. The Cherry Dam Spillway Short-Term Improvements project will minimize the potential spill damage by improving the portion of the spillway that is unlined with erosion protection measures and re-establishing containment for the breached spill channel section from the 2010 spill, improving the flood protection for the dam and downstream area under a normal spill event. The value of construction work is estimated to be $8 million with anticipated

construction completion in 2027; the total project cost is $15 million. The SFPUC also plans to include a long-term project in the future capital plan to increase the spillway capacity and retrofit the intake tower for seismic reliability.

Early Intake Dam. Early Intake Dam is a single-curvature concrete arch structure. It was constructed between 1923 and 1924 to divert Hetch Hetchy water from the Tuolumne River into the Mountain Tunnel. Within a few years of the dam's completion, significant cracking was observed at several locations, most likely due to the alkali-aggregate reactivity in the concrete. The structure has continued to deteriorate since then. Widely distributed and progressively worsening cracking has been observed throughout the dam and spillway structure over the years. The dam is reaching the end of its design life. The SFPUC has initiated a project to replace the dam. The Early Intake Dam Long-term Improvement Project will remove the existing concrete structure and construct a new facility to allow diversion of flows into Mountain Tunnel for water delivery under emergency and drought conditions. The SFPUC is considering a wide variety of alternatives, including, but not limited to, using pumps, low head weirs, tunnels, pipelines, and other water sources to supplement water supply to the Bay Area assuming the dam is removed. It is expected to take six years, from 2024 to 2029, to resolve complex environmental issues, water supply reliability issues, and obtain necessary approvals. The cost of construction work is estimated to be over $50 million dollars. The planning phase of the project has started, with anticipated construction completion in 2034.

Moccasin Lower Dam. In 2018, the town of Moccasin experienced more than 5.0 inches of precipitation over a 24-hour period, of which 3.1 inches fell within a four-hour period. The torrent of rain caused severe flood damage to the facilities in Moccasin and almost overtopped Moccasin Dam. After the event, the SFPUC issued emergency contracts to remove debris and perform emergency interim repairs. All of the emergency repairs were completed in 2020. To ensure dam safety and minimize potential flood damage in the future, the SFPUC re-evaluated the required flood protection for the dam and downstream facilities. The scope of work for the Moccasin Dam Long-Term Improvements project includes re-constructing the auxiliary spillway to handle the updated inflow design flood and building additional measures to protect the major facilities. The project will consist of constructing a new ungated side channel spillway at the right abutment along the alignment of the existing auxiliary spill channel. Additional erosion protection will also be considered for both upstream and downstream of the reservoir. Planning began in 2020 to define the scope of the spillway improvements; construction is anticipated to occur in 2030-2033 to allow sufficient time for planning, engineering design, and environmental agency approvals. The value of construction work is estimated to be over $100 million dollars with an estimated total project cost of $142 million, and anticipated construction completion in 2033.

Pilarcitos Dam. Pilarcitos Dam is a 95-foot-high earth fill embankment dam originally constructed in 1866 by the Spring Valley Water Company, with a reservoir capacity of approximately 3,100 acre-feet. An overall condition and needs assessment of the facility was completed in 2021. The study identified that the embankment and the appurtenant structures have operational and dam safety (seismic and hydraulic) improvement needs. The scope of work for Pilarcitos Dam includes upgrades to the embankment, outlet structure, and spillway to meet seismic safety standards and to pass the updated inflow design flood. Conceptual engineering design for two alternatives, representing the highest and lowest capital costs, is currently underway. Pre-construction is scheduled to complete in 2031 with construction scheduled for completion in 2034. The estimated project budget is $64 million.

San Andreas Dam. San Andreas Dam is a 105-foot-high earth fill embankment dam built in 1870 and modified in 1875. The dam impounds a 19,000-acre-foot reservoir in San Mateo County. An overall condition and needs assessment for the dam was completed in 2021, identifying the need to improve and upgrade the embankment and emergency outlet release facilities along with the spillway, where improvement needs were previously identified in 2019. Preliminary scope of work at San Andreas Dam includes the construction of a new spillway, a seismic stability study of the embankment, and a feasibility study of an emergency release outlet structure. Based on the condition assessment results, seismic safety standards, and the need to pass the updated inflow design flood, the dam's embankment, spillway, and emergency release outlet structure would all require retrofit and/or replacement under one construction contract. Alternatives analysis is currently underway. Once completed, scope of work, schedule and budget will be updated. Pre-construction for the entire project is scheduled to be complete in 2031 with construction scheduled for completion in 2033. The current estimated project budget is $32 million, but this may be increased after project needs are further determined.

Turner Dam. Turner Dam is a 195-foot-high earth fill embankment dam constructed in 1965. The dam impounds the 50,500-acre-foot San Antonio Reservoir in Alameda County. An overall condition and needs assessment for the facility, including the embankment, spillway and outlet works, began in 2020 and is part of a project to perform necessary upgrades anticipated to be completed by 2034. Results from the latest condition assessment, including an analysis performed in 2023, indicate that the dam embankment, spillway, and outlet works would all need to be retrofitted and/or replaced to meet the seismic safety standard and to pass the updated inflow design flood. Since this project is still in the early planning phase, the schedule and budget for the upgrade project will be updated when the scope is better defined for the selected alternative. The project is preliminarily scheduled to complete pre-construction in 2031, with construction from 2032 to 2034.

Calaveras Reservoir Expansion. Completed in 2019, the Calaveras Dam has a reservoir capacity of 96,800 acre-feet and was designed to accommodate a potential future enlargement. This project was intended to add up to an additional 289,000 acre-feet of additional water storage to the Calaveras Dam that could be available in all water year types. This project included raising the dam, expanding the capacity of the outlet structures and spillway, and adding necessary transmission and pumping infrastructure to convey water to the Calaveras Reservoir. This project has been deferred due to, among other reasons, high capital cost requirements, and may be reevaluated in the future. See "CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER WATER SUPPLY INITIATIVES – Water Supply Initiatives – *AWS Program – AWS Projects – Calaveras Reservoir Expansion (Deferred)*."

Merced Manor Reservoir. The Merced Manor Reservoir project will seismically strengthen and repair the roof of the reservoir. Scope of the project includes structural evaluation of the existing roof structure per current seismic code, design for seismic strengthening and repair, and construction of improvements. Pre-construction is underway with construction completion anticipated by 2031. The total project budget in the 2026 Capital Plan is $12 million.

Summit Reservoir. Summit Reservoir is a 14 million-gallon (43 acre-feet) capacity potable water storage reservoir on Twin Peaks in San Francisco that was built during the 1950s. Based on the as-built drawings, the original inlet/outlet structure appeared to be backfilled with compacted fill, whereas the majority of the reservoir is constructed on bedrock. Following the WSIP-funded seismic improvements, roof strengthening, and installation of new inlet/outlet structure that was completed in 2012, the DSOD reviewed the reservoir improvements and concluded that the reservoir met the criteria to be under their jurisdiction as a "dam" due to the original outlet structure embankment. In 2017, at the request of the DSOD, an engineering evaluation was performed in order to analyze the subsurface conditions and confirm that the seismic improvements performed under the WSIP were adequate, particularly in the area of embankment fill where the original inlet-outlet facilities were constructed. In 2019, a geotechnical investigation report was submitted to the DSOD that provided additional test results and information about the subsurface materials and conditions and concluded that the ground and the embankment appear to be stable. In 2021, an inspection of the concrete floor and walls in the West basin showed degradation of the sealant joints as well as some cracking and spalling along the floor and walls. Pre-construction of the repairs will be completed in 2025 and the repair of the cracks will be performed in 2026-2027, with similar repairs to any potential cracks in the East basin thereafter. Total project cost is less than $2 million; additional budget will be requested in the future if needed.

Stanford Heights Reservoir. Stanford Heights Reservoir, a potable water storage reservoir located within San Francisco, is impounded by a 31-foot-high earth fill dam constructed in 1928. The SFPUC performed a stability analysis in 1993, and an updated seismic stability and deformation analysis check of the embankment in 1997. Further geotechnical and seismic stability investigations are needed to determine if improvements may be necessary. Further investigations and pre-construction activities are planned for 2026 to 2027, with potential construction, if needed, in 2028 to 2030.

Sunset Reservoir South Basin. In a 1996 study, the SFPUC recommended seismic strengthening of the roof structure and other associated reservoir structural elements at the Sunset Reservoir South Basin which is formed with a 34-foot-high earth fill dam within San Francisco. However, due to budgetary prioritization decisions made by the SFPUC, and because the North Basin was seismically retrofitted, those recommendations were deferred. In 2018, a structural and seismic performance review of the Sunset South Basin recommended updating the seismic evaluation of the roof structure and structural elements prior to performing a structural improvement project. A project to strengthen the reservoir roof structure and other structural components if needed is scheduled for pre-construction in 2026 to 2030 with construction completion in 2033.

University Mound South Basin. In a 1996 study, the SFPUC recommended seismic strengthening of the roof structure and other associated reservoir structural elements at the University Mound South Basin which is formed with a 17-foot-high earth fill dam within San Francisco. However, due to budgetary prioritization decisions, and because the North Basin was seismically retrofitted, those recommendations were deferred. A seismic stability and deformation analysis of the embankment conducted by DSOD in 2006 showed acceptable seismic performance of the embankment. Thus, it is anticipated that the improvement project will only be needed to seismically strengthen the roof structure and structural components of the reservoir. Pre-construction including planning is scheduled for 2026 to 2030, with improvements constructed by 2033.

Hazardous Material Management

The handling of hazardous materials is subject to a variety of federal and State regulations. The SFPUC currently complies with regulations regarding hazardous material safety with respect to hazardous material disposal and employee safety.

Endangered Species

Various species (including native fishes) present in and near the Tuolumne River and Bay Area streams (e.g., Alameda, San Mateo and Pilarcitos Creeks) are either listed or candidates for listing under the State or federal endangered species acts. New listings and future regulatory actions under the acts, or conditions placed in permits to undertake construction for certain capital projects, could potentially directly affect water supplies available to the Regional Water System. When necessary, the SFPUC works with the responsible State and federal agencies to obtain permits under the acts.

Required Instream Flow Schedules from Regional Water System Dams

In order to comply with federal and State permit requirements in connection with dam and reservoir improvements to be carried out as part of the WSIP, the SFPUC has implemented schedules of instream flow releases from Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to San Mateo Creek, from Calaveras Reservoir to Calaveras Creek/Alameda Creek, and from the Upper Alameda Creek Diversion Dam to Alameda Creek to enhance habitat for native species. The SFPUC is constructing the Alameda Creek Recapture Project to recover a portion of the loss of water supply associated with Calaveras Dam releases and bypasses.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS

The activities of the SFPUC and the Water Enterprise, including, without limitation, the establishment of rates for water service and the issuance of Bonds, are subject to several limitations under both State and local law. Certain of such limitations are summarized below. Additionally, such limitations may be revised, enhanced, expanded, or otherwise altered as provided under State and local law, including in certain instances by legislation adopted by State, regional or local authorities, including the State Legislature or the Board of Supervisors, or by California or San Francisco voters themselves through the power of initiative or referendum, by voting in favor of amendments to the Charter, or in any other lawful manner.

State Law Limitations

Tax and Spending Limitations. The taxing powers of public agencies in the State are limited by Article XIIIA of the California Constitution, added by an initiative amendment approved by the voters on June 6, 1978, and commonly known as Proposition 13.

Article XIIIA limits the maximum ad valorem tax on real property to 1% of "full cash value," which is defined as "the County Assessor's valuation of real property as shown on the Fiscal Year 1975-76 tax bill under 'full cash value' or, thereafter, the appraised value of real property when purchased, newly constructed, or a change in ownership has occurred after the 1975 assessment." The full cash value may be adjusted annually to reflect inflation at a rate not to exceed 2% per year, or reduction in the consumer price index or comparable local data, or declining property value caused by damage, destruction, or other factors.

The tax rate limitation referred to above does not apply to ad valorem taxes to pay the debt service on any indebtedness approved by the voters before July 1, 1978, or on any bonded indebtedness for the acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of the votes cast by the voters voting on the proposition.

Under the terms of Article XIIIA and pursuant to an allocation system created by implementing legislation, each county is required to levy the maximum ad valorem tax permitted by Article XIIIA and to distribute the proceeds to local agencies.

Assessed valuation growth allowed under Article XIIIA (new construction, change of ownership and up to 2% annual value growth) is allocated among the jurisdictions that serve the tax rate area within which the growth occurs. Local agencies and schools share the growth of base revenues from the tax rate area. Each year's growth allocation becomes part of each agency's allocation in the following year. The availability of revenues from tax bases to such entities may be affected by the existence of certain successor agencies to former redevelopment agencies that, under certain circumstances, may be entitled to such revenues resulting from the upgrading of certain property values.

Under State law, any fee that exceeds the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged may be considered a "special tax" that must be authorized by a two-thirds vote of the electorate. Accordingly, if a portion of the SFPUC's water user rates or capacity charges were determined by a court to exceed the reasonable cost of providing service, the SFPUC might not be permitted to continue to collect that portion unless it were authorized to do so by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast in an election to authorize the collection of that portion of the rates or fees. If the SFPUC were unable to obtain such a two-thirds majority vote and were unable to reduce costs, such failure could adversely affect the SFPUC's ability to pay the debt service on the 2025DEF Bonds. However, the reasonable cost of providing water services has been determined by the State Controller to include depreciation and allowance for the cost of capital improvements. In addition, State courts have determined that fees such as capacity charges will not be special taxes if they approximate the reasonable cost of constructing the water system improvements contemplated by the local agency imposing the fee.

The United States Supreme Court has upheld Article XIIIA against a challenge alleging violation of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Proposition 218. Proposition 218, a State ballot initiative known as the "Right to Vote on Taxes Act," was approved by California voters on November 5, 1996. The initiative added Articles XIIIC and XIIID to the California

Constitution, creating additional requirements for the imposition by most local governments of "general taxes," "special taxes," "assessments," "fees," and "charges." Articles XIIIC and XIIID became effective, pursuant to their terms, as of November 6, 1996, although compliance with some of the provisions was deferred until July 1, 1997, and certain of the provisions purport to apply to any tax imposed for general governmental purposes (i.e., "general taxes") imposed, extended or increased on or after January 1, 1995 and prior to November 6, 1996.

Article XIIID imposes substantive and procedural requirements on the imposition, extension or increase of any "fee" or "charge" subject to its provisions. A "fee" or "charge" subject to Article XIIID includes any levy, other than an ad valorem tax, special tax or assessment, imposed by an agency upon a parcel or upon a person as an incident of property ownership. Article XIIID prohibits, among other things, the imposition of any proposed fee or charge, and, possibly, the increase of any existing fee or charge, in the event written protests against the proposed fee or charge are presented at a required public hearing on the fee or charge by a majority of owners of the parcels upon which the fee or charge is to be imposed. Except for fees and charges for water, sewer and refuse collection services, the approval of a majority of the property owners subject to the fee or charge, or at the option of the agency, by a two-thirds vote of the electorate residing in the affected area, is required not less than 45 days following the public hearing on any such proposed new or increased fee or charge. In the view of the SFPUC, rates for water usage charged by the SFPUC to the wholesale customers are not fees or charges under Article XIIID, although no assurance may be given by the SFPUC that a court would not determine otherwise.

The California Supreme Court decisions in *Richmond v. Shasta Community Services District*, 32 Cal. 4th 409 (2004) ("**Richmond**"), and *Bighorn-Desert View Water Agency v. Verjil*, 39 Cal. 4th 206 (2006) ("**Bighorn**") have clarified uncertainty surrounding the applicability of Section 6 of Article XIIID to service fees and charges. In Richmond, the Shasta Community Services District charged a water connection fee, which included a capacity charge for capital improvements to the water system and a fire suppression charge. The Court held that both the capacity charge and the fire suppression charge were not subject to Article XIIID because a water connection fee is not a property-related fee or charge because it results from the property owner's voluntary decision to apply for the connection. In both Richmond and Bighorn, however, the Court stated that a fee for ongoing water service through an existing connection is imposed "as an incident of property ownership" within the meaning of Article XIIID, rejecting, in Bighorn, the water agency's argument that consumption-based water charges are not imposed "as an incident of property ownership" but as a result of the voluntary decisions of customers as to how much water to use.

On July 15, 2024, the California Court of Appeal issued a decision in *Coziahr v. Otay Water District*, 103 Cal. App. 5th 785 (2024), upholding the judgment of the lower court that Otay Water District's tiered water rates were not compliant with Proposition 218. The court affirmed that water service rates subject to Proposition 218, including tiered water structures, must adhere to the proportionality requirement in Proposition 218 and that promoting water use conservation through water rates did not provide a basis for setting rates that exceed the proportional cost of service. The court also noted the principle established in *City of Palmdale v. Palmdale Water District*, 198 Cal. App. 4th 926 (2011), that rate differentials between groups, whether customers or tiers, support an inference of disproportionality and, to be constitutional, must be supported by evidence of costs justifying the differences. Similar water rate challenges under Proposition 218 have been filed against other public agencies in California and are currently pending. The SFPUC is unable to predict the outcome of any such ongoing litigation or any future litigation under Proposition 218 that may follow. The SFPUC's rate structure has not been challenged in a similar manner at this time.

The SFPUC provides public notice of proposed water rate increases in accordance with the requirements of Article XIIID through means that include, among others, holding informational presentations at community group meetings, mailings to residential and commercial customers of public hearings on rate increases, and press releases and media campaigns regarding rate increases, followed by public hearings conducted by the SFPUC's Rate Fairness Board and by the SFPUC itself. The SFPUC also develops and adopts retail utility user rates and fees in accordance with the requirements of Article XIIID(6)(b) that limit property-related fees and charges.

Article XIIIC extends the people's initiative power to reduce or repeal previously authorized local taxes, assessments, fees and charges. This extension of the initiative power is not limited by the terms of Article XIIIC to fees, taxes, assessment fees and charges imposed after November 6, 1996 and absent other authority could result in retroactive reduction in any existing taxes, assessments, fees or charges. In Bighorn, the Court concluded that under Article XIIIC local voters by initiative may reduce a public agency's water rates and delivery charges. The Court

noted, however, that it was not holding that the authorized initiative power is free of all limitations, stating that it was not determining whether the electorate's initiative power is subject to the public agency's statutory obligation to set water service charges at a level that will "pay the operating expenses of the agency, … provide for repairs and depreciation of works, provide a reasonable surplus for improvements, extensions, and enlargements, pay the interest on any bonded debt, and provide a sinking or other fund for the payment of the principal of such debt as it may become due."

Two class action cases have been filed and consolidated in the Superior Court of the State of California for County of San Francisco, challenging the compliance of the SFPUC's water rates with Proposition 218: *Toy v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. CPF-22-517764 (Cal. Super. Ct.), and *Aquilina v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. CPF-23-518342 (Cal. Super. Ct.) (collectively, the "**Complaints**"). The principal claim of the Complaints is that the SFPUC has violated Proposition 218 by imposing rates that exceed the costs of service by including the costs of hydrants and associated water flows in water rates. The SFPUC believes the claims in the Complaints are inconsistent with California Government Code section 53750.5, which addresses the treatment of hydrant costs in water rates. The SFPUC cannot predict the outcome of the cases, however the SFPUC believes that its rate structure has been developed in compliance with all applicable laws in all material respects. On May 16, 2025, the Superior Court granted the City's motion for judgment on the pleadings in the *Aquilina* case and did not provide plaintiffs leave to amend their complaint due to their failure to properly follow the California validation procedures that were a prerequisite to them perfecting their claims.

The courts have not fully interpreted the provisions of Proposition 218. The SFPUC is unable to predict how courts will further interpret Article XIIIC and Article XIIID, and what, if any, further implementing legislation will be enacted. Under the Bighorn case, San Francisco voters could adopt an initiative measure that reduces or repeals the SFPUC's water rates and charges, though it is not clear whether (and courts have not decided whether) any such reduction or repeal by initiative would be enforceable in a situation in which such rates and charges are pledged to the repayment of bonded indebtedness. There can be no assurance that the courts will not further interpret, or the voters will not amend, Article XIIIC and Article XIIID to limit the ability of the SFPUC to impose, levy, charge and collect increased fees and charges for the Water Enterprise, or to call into question water rate increases previously adopted by the SFPUC. No assurance may be given that Articles XIIIC and XIIID will not have a material adverse impact on Revenues.

Proposition 26. Proposition 26, which amended Article XIIIA and XIIIC of the California Constitution, was approved by the electorate at the November 2, 2010 election. Proposition 26 imposes a two-thirds voter approval requirement for the imposition of fees and charges by the State. It also imposes a majority voter approval requirement on local governments with respect to fees and charges for general purposes, and a two-thirds voter approval requirement with respect to fees and charges for special purposes. According to its supporters, Proposition 26 was designed to prevent the circumvention of tax limitations imposed by the voters pursuant to Proposition 13, approved in 1978, Proposition 218, and other measures through the use of non-tax fees and charges.

Proposition 26 expressly excludes from its scope "a charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable cost to the governmental entity of providing the service or product to the payor" and "assessments and property-related fees imposed in accordance with the provisions of Article XIIID." The California Supreme Court has held that a fee for ongoing water service through an existing connection is imposed "as an incident of property ownership" within the meaning of Article XIIID. See "– Proposition 218." The SFPUC believes that the initiative is not intended to, and would not, apply to fees for water deliveries and services charged by the SFPUC. The SFPUC, however, is unable to predict how Proposition 26 will be interpreted by the courts to apply to the provision of water services by local governments such as the SFPUC.

Initiative and Referendum

Article XIIIA and Articles XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution were adopted pursuant to the State's constitutional initiative process. From time to time other initiative measures could be adopted by California or San Francisco voters, placing additional limitations on, the SFPUC's revenues or ability to increase revenues.

Charter Limitations

The Charter requires that bonds (such as the Bonds) secured by revenues, other than refunding bonds, may be issued only with the assent of a majority of voters. However, under the Charter amendments enacted by the voters in November 2002 (Proposition E), the SFPUC may issue revenue bonds, including notes, commercial paper or other forms of indebtedness, when authorized by ordinance approved by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, for the purpose of reconstructing, replacing, expanding, repairing or improving water facilities or clean water facilities or combinations of water and clean water facilities under the jurisdiction of the SFPUC (and subject to the further conditions contained in Proposition E). See "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Authority for Issuance of Revenue Bonds and Other Obligations Payable from Revenues – *Proposition E*."

In June 1998, the electorate of the City approved Proposition H which, subject to certain exceptions, including a limited exception to raise rates to pay debt service on voter-approved debt, froze the SFPUC's water rates through July 1, 2006. The SFPUC can give no assurance that the electorate will not seek in the future to freeze or limit rate increases.

Future Charter Amendments

San Francisco voters could adopt additional Charter amendments in the future which would limit the ability of the SFPUC to issue debt or to enact rate increases, affect the financial condition or operation of the Water Enterprise or implement other changes affecting the financial condition or operations of the SFPUC and the Water Enterprise. See "RISK FACTORS – Other Risks – Initiative, Referendum, Charter Amendments and Future Legislation."

LITIGATION

The SFPUC is not aware of any litigation pending or threatened questioning the political existence of the City or the SFPUC or contesting the SFPUC's power to fix Water Enterprise rates and charges, or in any way questioning or affecting:

(i) the proceedings under which the 2025DEF Bonds are to be issued,

(ii) the validity of any provision of the 2025DEF Bonds or the Indenture,

(iii) the pledge of Revenues by the SFPUC under the Indenture, or

(iv) the titles to office of the present members of the Board of Supervisors and the Commission.

There are several suits and claims pending against the City and the SFPUC impacting the Water Enterprise, which may include personal injury, wrongful death and other suits and claims against which the City may self-insure. The aggregate amount of the self-insured liabilities of the City and the SFPUC which may result from such suits and claims will not, in the opinion of the City Attorney, materially impair the ability of the SFPUC to pay principal of or interest on the 2025DEF Bonds as they become due. Other than as disclosed elsewhere in this Official Statement, there is no litigation pending, with service of process having been accomplished, against the City or the SFPUC which if determined adversely to the City or the SFPUC would, in the opinion of the City Attorney, materially impair the ability of the SFPUC to pay principal of and interest on the 2025DEF Bonds as they become due. See also "CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND CHARTER LIMITATIONS – State Law Limitations – Proposition 218."

TAX MATTERS

Federal Tax Exemption. In the opinion of Bond Counsel to the SFPUC, under existing statutes, regulations, rulings and judicial decisions, and assuming compliance by the Commission with certain covenants in the applicable resolution, the Tax Certificate and other documents pertaining to the 2025DEF Bonds and requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "**Code**") regarding the use, expenditure and investment of proceeds of the 2025DEF Bonds and the timely payment of certain investment earnings to the United States, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is not included in the gross income of the owners of the 2025DEF Bonds for federal income tax purposes. Failure to comply

with such covenants and requirements may cause interest on the 2025DEF Bonds to be included in gross income retroactive to the date of issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds.

In the further opinion of Bond Counsel, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is not treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax on individuals. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion regarding the applicability of the federal corporate alternative minimum tax to the adjusted financial statement income of certain corporations.

Ownership of, or the receipt of interest on, tax-exempt obligations may result in collateral federal income tax consequences to certain taxpayers, including, without limitation, financial institutions, property and casualty insurance companies, certain foreign corporations doing business in the United States, certain S corporations with excess passive income, individual recipients of Social Security or Railroad Retirement benefits, taxpayers that may be deemed to have incurred or continued indebtedness to purchase or carry tax-exempt obligations and taxpayers who may be eligible for the earned income tax credit. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion with respect to any collateral tax consequences and, accordingly, prospective purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds should consult their tax advisors as to the applicability of any collateral tax consequences.

Certain requirements and procedures contained or referred to in the applicable resolution, the Tax Certificate or other documents pertaining to the 2025DEF Bonds may be changed, and certain actions may be taken or not taken, under the circumstances and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in such documents, upon the advice or with the approving opinion of counsel nationally recognized in the area of tax-exempt obligations. Bond Counsel expresses no opinion as to the effect of any change to any document pertaining to the 2025DEF Bonds or of any action taken or not taken where such change is made or action is taken or not taken without the approval of Bond Counsel or in reliance upon the advice of counsel other than Bond Counsel with respect to the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the 2025DEF Bonds for federal income tax purposes.

Bond Counsel's opinion is not a guarantee of result, but represents its legal judgment based upon its review of existing statutes, regulations, published rulings and judicial decisions and the representations and covenants of the Commission described above. No ruling has been sought from the Internal Revenue Service (the "**IRS**") with respect to the matters addressed in the opinion of Bond Counsel, and Bond Counsel's opinion is not binding on the IRS. The IRS has an ongoing program of examining the tax-exempt status of the interest on municipal obligations. If an examination of the 2025DEF Bonds is commenced, under current procedures the IRS is likely to treat the Commission as the "taxpayer," and the owners of the 2025DEF Bonds would have no right to participate in the examination process. In responding to or defending an examination of the tax-exempt status of the interest on the 2025DEF Bonds, the Commission may have different or conflicting interests from the owners. Additionally, public awareness of any future examination of the 2025DEF Bonds could adversely affect the value and liquidity of the 2025DEF Bonds during the pendency of the examination, regardless of its ultimate outcome.

Tax Accounting Treatment of Bond Premium. To the extent a purchaser acquires a 2025DEF Bond at a price in excess of the amount payable at its maturity, such excess will constitute "bond premium" under the Code. The Code and applicable Treasury Regulations provide generally that bond premium on a tax-exempt obligation is amortized over the remaining term of the obligation (or a shorter period in the case of certain callable obligations) based on the obligation's yield to maturity (or shorter period in the case of certain callable obligations). The amount of premium so amortized reduces the owner's basis in such obligation for federal income tax purposes, though such amortized premium is not deductible for federal income tax purposes. This reduction in basis will increase the amount of any gain (or decrease the amount of any loss) recognized for federal income tax purposes upon a sale or other taxable disposition of the obligation. Bond Counsel is not opining on the accounting for bond premium or the consequence to a 2025DEF Bond purchaser of purchasing a 2025DEF Bond with bond premium. Accordingly, persons considering the purchase of 2025DEF Bonds with bond premium should consult their own tax advisors with respect to the determination of bond premium on such 2025DEF Bonds for federal income tax purposes and with respect to the state and local tax consequences of owning and disposing of such 2025DEF Bonds.

Tax Accounting Treatment of Original Issue Discount. The excess, if any, of the stated redemption price at maturity of 2025DEF Bonds of a particular maturity over the initial offering price to the public of the 2025DEF Bonds of that maturity at which a substantial amount of the 2025DEF Bonds of that maturity is sold to the public is "original issue discount." Original issue discount accruing on a 2025DEF Bond is treated as interest excluded from the gross

income of the owner thereof for federal income tax purposes under the same conditions and limitations as are applicable to interest payable on such 2025DEF Bond. Original issue discount on a 2025DEF Bond of a particular maturity purchased pursuant to the initial public offering at the initial public offering price at which a substantial amount of the 2025DEF Bonds of that maturity is sold to the public accrues on a semiannual basis over the term of the 2025DEF Bond on the basis of a constant yield; and within each semiannual period accrues on a ratable daily basis. The amount of original issue discount on a 2025DEF Bond accruing during each period is added to the adjusted basis of such 2025DEF Bond, which will affect the amount of taxable gain upon disposition (including sale, redemption or payment on maturity) of such 2025DEF Bond. The Code includes certain provisions relating to the accrual of original issue discount in the case of purchasers that purchase 2025DEF Bonds other than at the initial offering price. Bond Counsel is not opining on the accounting for or consequence to a 2025DEF Bond purchaser of purchasing a 2025DEF Bond with original issue discount. Accordingly, persons considering the purchase of 2025DEF Bonds with original issue discount should consult their own tax advisors with respect to the determination of original issue discount on such 2025DEF Bonds for federal income tax purposes and with respect to the state and local tax consequences of owning and disposing of such 2025DEF Bonds.

Information Reporting and Backup Withholding. Interest paid on the 2025DEF Bonds will be subject to information reporting in a manner similar to interest paid on taxable obligations. Although such reporting requirement does not, in and of itself, affect the excludability of such interest from gross income for federal income tax purposes, such reporting requirement causes the payment of interest on the 2025DEF Bonds to be subject to backup withholding if such interest is paid to beneficial owners who (a) are not "exempt recipients," and (b) either fail to provide certain identifying information (such as the beneficial owner's taxpayer identification number) in the required manner or have been identified by the IRS as having failed to report all interest and dividends required to be shown on their income tax returns. Generally, individuals are not exempt recipients, whereas corporations and certain other entities are exempt recipients. Amounts withheld under the backup withholding rules from a payment to a beneficial owner are allowed as a refund or credit against such beneficial owner's federal income tax liability so long as the required information is furnished to the IRS.

State Tax Exemption. In the further opinion of Bond Counsel, interest on the 2025DEF Bonds is exempt from personal income taxes imposed by the State of California.

Future Developments. Existing law may change to reduce or eliminate the benefit to owners of the 2025DEF Bonds of the exclusion of the interest on the 2025DEF Bonds from gross income for federal income tax purposes or of the exemption of interest on the 2025DEF Bonds from State of California personal income taxation. Any proposed legislation, whether or not enacted, or administrative action, whether or not taken, could also affect the value and marketability of the 2025DEF Bonds. Prospective purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds should consult their own tax advisors with respect to any proposed or future change in tax law.

Proposed Forms of Opinions. The proposed forms of opinions of Bond Counsel regarding the 2025DEF Bonds are attached in APPENDIX D.

CERTAIN LEGAL MATTERS

Certain legal matters incident to the authorization, sale and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds are subject to the approval of Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, San Francisco, California, Bond Counsel to the SFPUC. Certain legal matters are being passed upon for the SFPUC by the City Attorney and by Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, San Francisco, California ("**Disclosure Counsel**"). Certain legal matters are being passed upon for the Underwriters by Hawkins Delafield & Wood LLP, San Francisco, California. Bond Counsel and Disclosure Counsel will receive compensation that is contingent upon the sale and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds.

The forms of approving opinions of Bond Counsel are set forth in Appendix D and will be available at the time of delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds. Bond Counsel is not passing upon and undertakes no responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or fairness of the information contained in this Official Statement.

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP has served as Disclosure Counsel to the SFPUC and in such capacity has advised the SFPUC with respect to the requirements of applicable securities laws and participated with responsible SFPUC officials and staff in conferences and meetings where information contained in this Official Statement was

reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Disclosure Counsel is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the information presented in this Official Statement and has not undertaken to independently verify any of such information. Rather, the SFPUC is solely responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the information contained in this Official Statement. Upon the issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP will deliver a letter to the SFPUC concerning certain matters with respect to the Official Statement. No purchaser or holder of the 2025DEF Bonds, or other person or party other than the SFPUC, will be entitled to rely on such letter or on the fact that Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP has acted as Disclosure Counsel to the SFPUC.

RATINGS

Moody's Investors Service ("**Moody's**") has assigned its municipal bond rating of "Aa2" to the 2025DEF Bonds, and S&P Global Ratings, a Standard & Poor's Financial Services LLC business ("**S&P**"), has assigned its municipal bond rating of "AA-" to the 2025DEF Bonds.

The ratings assigned by Moody's and S&P express only the views of the respective rating agencies. The explanation of the significance of these ratings, and any outlook associated with these ratings, may be obtained from Moody's and S&P, respectively. Each rating agency generally bases its rating on its own investigations, studies, and assumptions. The SFPUC has provided certain additional information and materials to the rating agencies (some of which does not appear in this Official Statement).

A securities rating is not a recommendation to buy, sell or hold securities and may be subject to revision or withdrawal at any time. There is no assurance such ratings will continue for any given period of time or that such ratings will not be revised downward or withdrawn entirely by the rating agencies, if in the judgment of such rating agencies, circumstances so warrant. Any such downward revision or withdrawal of such ratings may have an adverse effect on the market price of the 2025DEF Bonds. The SFPUC undertakes no responsibility to maintain its current ratings on the 2025DEF Bonds or to oppose any such downward revision, suspension or withdrawal.

UNDERWRITING

The 2025DEF Bonds are being purchased by J.P. Morgan Securities LLC ("**J.P. Morgan**"), as representative on behalf of itself and Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC, Barclays Capital Inc., Samuel A. Ramirez & Co., Inc., Siebert Williams Shank & Co., LLC, and Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated (collectively, the "**Underwriters**").

The Underwriters have agreed to purchase from the SFPUC the 2025D Bonds at a purchase price of $309,533,476.72 (consisting of $304,505,000.00 aggregate principal amount of the 2025D Bonds, plus original issue premium of $5,465,419.05, less an underwriters' discount of $436,942.33), the 2025E Bonds at a purchase price of $138,812,744.97 (consisting of $133,480,000.00 aggregate principal amount of the 2025E Bonds, plus original issue premium of $5,524,737.20, less an underwriters' discount of $191,992.23), and the 2025F Bonds at a purchase price of $608,007,277.65 (consisting of $550,275,000.00 aggregate principal amount of the 2025F Bonds, plus net original issue premium of $58,523,311.35, less an underwriters' discount of $791,033.70). Under the bond purchase contract to be entered into in connection with the purchase of the 2025DEF Bonds, the Underwriters will be obligated to purchase all of the 2025DEF Bonds if any are purchased, the obligation to make such purchase being subject to certain terms and conditions to be satisfied by the SFPUC.

The Underwriters have certified the reoffering yields with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds set forth on the inside cover page of this Official Statement. The SFPUC takes no responsibility for the accuracy of these yields. The Underwriters may offer and sell the 2025DEF Bonds to certain dealers and others yields higher than the offering yields stated on the inside cover page. The offering yields may be changed from time to time by the Underwriters.

The Underwriters and their respective affiliates are full service financial institutions engaged in various activities, which may include securities trading, commercial and investment banking, advisory, investment management, principal investment, hedging, financing and brokerage activities. Certain of the Underwriters and their respective affiliates have, from time to time, performed, and may in the future perform, various investment banking services for the SFPUC for which they received or will receive customary fees.

In the ordinary course of their various business activities, the Underwriters and their respective affiliates may make or hold a broad array of investments and actively trade debt and equity securities (or related derivative securities) and financial instruments (which may include bank loans and/or credit default swaps) for their own account and for the accounts of their customers and may at any time hold long and short positions in such securities and instruments. Such investment and securities activities may involve securities and instruments of the SFPUC.

J.P. Morgan, one of the Underwriters of the 2025DEF Bonds, has entered into negotiated dealer agreements (each, a "**Dealer Agreement**") with each of Charles Schwab & Co., Inc. ("**CS&Co**.") and LPL Financial LLC ("**LPL**") for the retail distribution of certain securities offerings at the original issue prices. Pursuant to each Dealer Agreement (if applicable to this transaction), each of CS&Co. and LPL will purchase 2025DEF Bonds from J.P. Morgan at the original issue price less a negotiated portion of the selling concession applicable to any 2025DEF Bonds that such firm sells.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Attached as Appendix C are the audited financial statements of the Water Enterprise for Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2022-23, prepared by the SFPUC. The audited financial statements were audited by Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP, independent certified public accountants. The audited financial statements are included for convenience.

The audited financial statements of the SFPUC are public documents and the SFPUC has not requested nor did the SFPUC obtain permission from the auditors to include the audited financial statements as an Appendix to this Official Statement. Accordingly, the auditor have made no representation in connection with inclusion of the audit financial statements herein that there has been no material change in the financial condition of the SFPUC since the most recent audit was concluded. The auditors have not been engaged to perform and have not performed, since the date of the report included herein, any procedures on the financial statements addressed in that report. The auditors also have not performed any procedures relating to this Official Statement.

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE

The SFPUC will covenant for the benefit of the Owners and Beneficial Owners of the 2025DEF Bonds, under a continuing disclosure certificate dated as of the date of delivery (the "**Disclosure Certificate**"), to provide certain financial information and operating data regarding the Water Enterprise (the "**Annual Report**") not later than March 31 following the end of its Fiscal Year (presently June 30), beginning on March 31, 2026, with the report for Fiscal Year 2024-25, and to promptly provide notices of the occurrence of certain enumerated events set forth in the Disclosure Certificate ("**Listed Events**").

The SFPUC will agree to file the Annual Report and any notice of Listed Events as described in the Disclosure Certificate. The specific nature of the information to be contained in the Annual Report or the notices of Listed Events is set forth in the Disclosure Certificate. These covenants have been made to assist the Underwriters in complying with the Rule. The form of the Disclosure Certificate is attached to this Official Statement as Appendix E.

In 2017, the SFPUC and U.S. Bank National Association ("**U.S. Bank**") entered into revolving credit agreements providing for the extension of credit to the SFPUC in the amount of $100,000,000 for the Water Enterprise and $75,000,000 for the Wastewater Enterprise. The SFPUC has not drawn on either credit facility and has no outstanding obligations thereunder. On January 7, 2022, the SFPUC and U.S. Bank entered into amendments to such credit facilities extending the respective commitment expiration dates to July 18, 2024. The SFPUC filed listed event notices regarding such extensions on February 3, 2022.

CO-MUNICIPAL ADVISORS

Montague DeRose and Associates, LLC, Walnut Creek, California, and Backstrom McCarley Berry & Co., LLC, San Francisco, California (the "**Co-Municipal Advisors**"), are acting as co-municipal advisors to the SFPUC with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds. The Co-Municipal Advisors have assisted the SFPUC in the preparation of this Official Statement and in other matters relating to the planning, structuring, execution and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds. The Co-Municipal Advisors have not independently verified any of the data contained herein or conducted a detailed investigation of the affairs of the SFPUC to determine the accuracy or completeness of this Official Statement. Because of its limited participation, the Co-Municipal Advisors assume no responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of any of the information contained herein. The Co-Municipal Advisors will not purchase or make a market in any of the 2025DEF Bonds.

The compensation to be received by the Co-Municipal Advisors from the SFPUC for services provided in connection with the planning, structuring, execution and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds is contingent upon the sale and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds.

VERIFICATION OF MATHEMATICAL ACCURACY

AW Smith LLC, Rockford, Minnesota, as verification agent, will verify, from the information provided to it, the mathematical accuracy of the calculation of the Extraordinary Optional Redemption Price with respect to the extraordinary optional redemption of the Refunded Bonds. See "PLAN OF FINANCE."

INDEPENDENT PRICING CONSULTANT

PFM California Advisors LLC, San Francisco, California, is acting as an independent pricing consultant to the SFPUC with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds (the "**Pricing Consultant**"). As required by the SFPUC's Debt Policies, the Pricing Consultant will monitor the pricing process and provide an independent pricing report to the SFPUC certifying whether the pricing results were fair and reasonable to the SFPUC in light of prevailing market conditions. The Pricing Consultant has not independently verified any of the data contained herein or conducted a detailed investigation of the affairs of the SFPUC to determine the accuracy or completeness of this Official Statement. Because of its limited participation, the Pricing Consultant assumes no responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of any of the information contained herein. The Pricing Consultant will not purchase or make a market in any of the 2025DEF Bonds.

The compensation to be received by the Pricing Consultant from the SFPUC for services provided in connection with the planning, structuring, execution and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds is contingent upon the sale and delivery of the 2025DEF Bonds.

MISCELLANEOUS

References made in this Official Statement to certain documents and reports are brief summaries thereof that do not purport to be complete or definitive, and reference is made to such documents and reports for full and complete statements of the contents thereof.

The appendices to this Official Statement are integral parts of this Official Statement. Investors must read the entire Official Statement, including the appendices, to obtain information essential to making an informed investment decision.

APPROVAL AND DELIVERY

This Official Statement has been duly approved, executed and delivered by the SFPUC.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: /s/ Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INDENTURE

This Appendix contains summaries of certain provisions of the Indenture, which are in addition and complementary to the summaries found in the Official Statement under the captions "INTRODUCTION" "THE 2025DEF BONDS" and "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS." The following summaries are qualified in their entirety by reference to the complete Indenture, a copy of which can be obtained from the Commission.

The Commission has approved amendments to the Indenture set forth in a Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, which amendments will take effect when the written consents of the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding have been filed with the Trustee and certain other requirements under the Indenture have been satisfied. The proposed amendments of the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture are summarized under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE" below.

DEFINITIONS

Accreted Value

The term "Accreted Value" means, with respect to any Capital Appreciation Bond, the principal amount thereof plus the interest accrued thereon from its date, compounded at the approximate interest rate thereof on each May 1 and November 1. The Accreted Values at any date to which reference is made will be the amounts set forth in the Accreted Value Table.

Accreted Value Table

The term "Accreted Value Table" means, with respect to any Capital Appreciation Bonds, the corresponding table attached as an Exhibit to the Indenture or to a Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which Additional Bonds constituting Capital Appreciation Bonds are issued.

Additional Bonds

The term "Additional Bonds" means bonds, notes or other obligations of the Commission payable from Revenues and ranking on a parity with the Bonds and authorized to be issued under and pursuant to the Indenture.

Balloon Indebtedness

The term "Balloon Indebtedness" means a Series of Bonds 25% or more of the principal of which matures on the same date and which amount is not required by the documents governing such Bonds to be amortized by payment or redemption prior to such date. For purposes of this definition, an optional or mandatory tender of Bonds for purchase as described within the definition of Tender Indebtedness will not be treated as a maturity. If any Series of Bonds consists partially of Variable Rate Indebtedness and partially of indebtedness bearing interest at a fixed rate, the portion constituting Variable Rate Indebtedness and the portion bearing interest at a fixed rate will be treated as separate issues for purposes of determining whether any such indebtedness constitutes Balloon Indebtedness.

Board of Supervisors

The term "Board of Supervisors" means the Board of Supervisors of the City from time to time or any other governing board of the City hereafter provided for pursuant to law.

Bond Obligation

The term "Bond Obligation" means, as of any given date of calculation, (1) with respect to any Outstanding Current Interest Bond, the principal amount of such Bond, (2) with respect to any Outstanding Capital Appreciation Bond, the Accreted Value thereof as of the May 1 or November 1 next preceding such date of calculation (unless such date of calculation is a May 1 or November 1 in which case as of such date), and (3) with respect to any outstanding Parity State Loan, the unpaid principal amount of the Parity State Loan.

Bondowner, Owner

The term "Bondowner" or "Owner" means any person who is the registered owner of any Outstanding Bond, or, if such Outstanding Bond has a maturity of one year or less and is issued in bearer form, means the bearer of such Bond, or, with respect to any Parity State Loan, means the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof).

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the definition of "Bondowner" or "Owner" above will be amended as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Definitions" below.

Bond Reserve Fund

The term "Bond Reserve Fund" means the fund by that name established under the Indenture.

Bond Reserve Fund Policy

The term "Bond Reserve Fund Policy" means a policy of insurance or surety bond issued by a Municipal Bond Insurer, obligations insured by which have a rating by Moody's and S&P which is the highest rating then issued by said rating agency, or a Letter of Credit issued by a Qualified Bank, to satisfy all or a portion of the Required Reserve.

Bonds, Capital Appreciation Bonds, Current Interest Bonds, Serial Bonds, Term Bonds

The term "Bonds" means the San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds authorized by, and at any time Outstanding pursuant to, the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture, including any Additional Bonds authorized by, and at any time Outstanding pursuant to, the Indenture and any Supplemental Indenture, and includes bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness (other evidence of indebtedness includes Parity State Loans, but only for purposes of (i) the calculation of "Maximum Annual Debt Service", "Annual Debt Service", "Debt Service" and "Average Annual Debt Service" and (ii) the provisions of the Indenture described in "REVENUES AND FUNDS— Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund," "EVENTS OF DEFAULT AND REMEDIES OF BONDOWNERS--Events of Default; Acceleration," "—Bondholder Suits" and "--Application of Funds Upon Acceleration," and in the forepart as "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS—Rate Covenants") payable from Revenues on a parity with the Outstanding Bonds.

The term "Current Interest Bonds" means all or any portion of a Series of Bonds designated as Current Interest Bonds and which pay interest at least semiannually to the Owners thereof excluding the first payment of interest thereon.

The term "Capital Appreciation Bonds" means all or any portion of a Series of Bonds designated as Capital Appreciation Bonds and on which interest is compounded and paid at maturity or on prior redemption.

The term "Serial Bonds" means all or any portion of a Series of Bonds designated as Serial Bonds and for which no Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments are provided.

The term "Term Bonds" means all or any portion of a Series of Bonds designated as Term Bonds and which are payable at or before their specified maturity date or dates from Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments established for that purpose and calculated to retire such Bonds on or before their specified maturity date or dates.

Build America Bonds

The term "Build America Bonds" means any bonds or other obligations issued as Build America Bonds under Section 54AA of the Code, or under any other provisions of the Code that creates, in the determination of the Commission, a substantially similar direct-pay subsidy program that provides comparable security for the Owners of the Bonds.

Business Day

The term "Business Day" means any day other than (1) a Saturday, Sunday or day upon which commercial banks in San Francisco, California, or New York, New York are authorized or required to be closed and (2) for purposes of payments and other actions relating to Bonds secured by a Letter of Credit, a day upon which commercial banks in the city in which is located the office of the Qualified Bank at which demands for payment under the Letter of Credit are to be presented are authorized to be closed.

Certificate of the Commission

The term "Certificate of the Commission" means an instrument in writing signed by the President or by the General Manager or by any other officer of the Commission or of the City duly authorized by the Commission for that purpose, and by the Secretary. Any such instrument and supporting opinions or representations, if any, may, but need not, be combined in a single instrument with any other instrument, opinion or representation, and the two or more so combined will be read and construed as a single instrument. If and to the extent required by the provisions of the Indenture, each Certificate of the Commission will include the statements provided for in the Indenture.

Charter

The term "Charter" means with respect to the Outstanding Bonds and any Additional Bonds, the Charter of the City as it now exists or as it may hereafter be amended, and any new or successor Charter.

City

The term "City" means the existing political subdivision known as the City and County of San Francisco, in the State of California, as the same is organized and existing under and by virtue of the Constitution and laws of the State of California and the Charter and any public body hereafter created which will be a successor thereto.

Code

The term "Code" means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

Commission

The term "Commission" means the Public Utilities Commission of the City duly constituted under the Charter, and all commissions, agencies or public bodies hereafter created which succeed to or take over the powers and duties of the Commission with respect to the Enterprise.

Consulting Engineers

The term "Consulting Engineers" means any engineer or firm of engineers retained by the Commission having a wide and favorable reputation for skill and experience in evaluating the construction and operation of public utilities, including public water supply, storage and distribution systems, or in other revenue producing publicly owned enterprises, to perform the acts and carry out the duties provided for such consulting engineers in the Indenture.

Controller

The term "Controller" means the Controller of the City from time to time and includes any deputy acting for the Controller.

Credit Provider

The term "Credit Provider" refers to a Municipal Bond Insurer that has issued an outstanding policy of municipal bond insurance or a Qualified Bank that is the issuer of an outstanding Letter of Credit which, in each case, secures payment of principal of, and interest on, or tender price of, all or a portion of a Series of Bonds; provided that this term will not refer to a Reserve Provider.

Effective Date

The term "Effective Date" means each date on which one or more of the respective provisions of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture becomes effective, being such time as the written consents of the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding and of each Credit Provider have been filed with the Trustee, and the other requirements contained in the Section entitled "Modification or Amendment of the Indenture" of the Indenture have been satisfied. The Effective Date of the provisions of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture occurred on or about April 16, 2015.

Enterprise or Water Enterprise

The term "Enterprise" or "Water Enterprise" means the whole and each and every part of the municipal water supply, storage and distribution system of the Commission, as located partially within and partially without the City, including all of said presently existing municipal water system of the City and all additions, betterments, and extensions to said water system or any part thereof thereafter made, but excluding any water supply, storage or distribution facilities under the jurisdiction of the Hetch Hetchy Project, a department of the City under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Event of Default

The term "Event of Default" means an event of that name described in the Indenture.

Federal Securities

The term "Federal Securities" means United States treasury notes, bonds, bills or certificates of indebtedness, or obligations for which the faith and credit of the United States of America are pledged for the payment of principal and interest (including obligations issued or held in book-entry form and securities which represent an undivided interest in such direct obligations), and also any securities now or hereafter authorized, both the principal of and interest on which is guaranteed directly by the full faith and credit of the United States of America, and including interest strips held in book-entry form by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York of bonds issued by the Resolution Funding Corporation. For all Additional Bonds issued subsequent to the date of the amendment and restatement of the Indenture in 2002, the term "Federal Securities" also includes bonds, debentures, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issued or guaranteed by any of the following federal agencies and provided such obligations are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America (stripped securities are only permitted if they have been stripped by the agency itself): (i) direct obligations or fully guaranteed certificates of beneficial ownership of the U.S. Export-Import Bank; (ii) certificates of beneficial ownership of the Rural Economic Community Development Administration (formerly the Farmers Home Administration); (iii) obligations of the Federal Financing Bank; (iv) debentures of the Federal Housing Administration; (v) participation certificates of the General Services Administration; (vi) guaranteed Title XI financings of the U.S. Maritime Administration; and (vii) project notes, local authority bonds, new communities debentures and U.S. public housing notes and bonds of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Fifth Supplemental Indenture

The term "Fifth Supplemental Indenture" means the Fifth Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2010, by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture

The term "Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture" means the Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture

The term "Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture" means the Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture

The term "Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture" means the Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

Financial Newspaper or Journal

The term "Financial Newspaper or Journal" means *The Wall Street Journal* or *The Bond Buyer*, or any other newspaper or journal publishing financial news and selected by the Trustee, whose decision will be final and conclusive, printed in the English language, customarily published on each business day and circulated in San Francisco, California.

Fiscal Year

The term "Fiscal Year" means the period beginning on July 1 of each year and ending on the next succeeding June 30, or such other fiscal year as may be adopted by the Commission for its general accounting purposes or the then current accounting period of the City if the Commission has no separate accounting period.

Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture

The term "Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture" means the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, dated as of July 1, 2023, by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

General Manager

The term "General Manager" means the manager of utilities appointed by the Commission from time to time pursuant to the Charter or any other applicable provision of law.

Improvement Fund

The term "Improvement Fund" means the fund by that name established pursuant to the Indenture.

Indenture

The term "Indenture" means the Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002, by and between the Commission and the Trustee, as originally executed or as it may from time to time be supplemented or amended by any Supplemental Indenture delivered pursuant to the provisions of the Indenture.

Independent Certified Public Accountant

The term "Independent Certified Public Accountant" means any certified public accountant or firm of such accountants appointed and paid by the City or the Commission, and who, or each of whom –

(i) is in fact independent and not under domination of the City or the Commission;

(ii) does not have any substantial interest, direct or indirect, with the City or the Commission; and

(iii) is not connected with the City or the Commission as an officer or employee of the City or the Commission, but who may be regularly retained to make annual or other audits of the books of or reports to the City or the Commission.

Law

The term "Law" means the Charter, the San Francisco Administrative Code, and all laws of the State of California supplemental thereto, including the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 to the extent made applicable by the Charter or by the San Francisco Administrative Code. Whenever reference is made in the Indenture to the Law, reference is made to the Law as in force on the date of the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture, unless the context otherwise requires.

Legal Investments

The term "Legal Investments" means bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, bills, acceptances or other securities in which funds of the Commission may now or hereafter be legally invested as provided by the law in effect at the time of such investment.

Letter of Credit

The term "Letter of Credit" means an irrevocable and unconditional letter of credit, a standby purchase agreement, a line of credit or other similar credit arrangement issued by a Qualified Bank to secure payment of Balloon Indebtedness, Variable Rate Indebtedness, Tender Indebtedness or a Series of Bonds or to satisfy all or a portion of the Required Reserve.

Letter of Credit Agreement

The term "Letter of Credit Agreement" means an agreement between the Commission and a Qualified Bank pursuant to which the Qualified Bank agrees to issue a Letter of Credit and which sets forth the repayment obligation of the Commission to the Qualified Bank on account of any payment under the Letter of Credit.

Letter of Representations

The term "Letter of Representations" means the letter or letters of representation of the Commission delivered to and accepted by The Depository Trust Company setting forth the basis on which The Depository Trust Company serves as depository for the Bonds, as originally executed or as it may be supplemented or revised or replaced by a letter to a substitute depository.

Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, Average Annual Debt Service

The term "Maximum Annual Debt Service" means, at any point in time, with respect to Bonds then Outstanding, the maximum amount of principal and interest becoming due in the then current or any future Fiscal Year, calculated by the Commission as provided in this definition. For purposes of calculating Maximum Annual Debt

Service, the following assumptions are to be used to calculate the principal and interest becoming due in any Fiscal Year:

(i) in determining the principal amount due in each year, payment will (unless a different subsection of this definition applies for purposes of determining principal maturities or amortization) be assumed to be made in accordance with any amortization schedule established for such debt, including any Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments or any scheduled redemption or payment of Bonds on the basis of Accreted Value, and for such purpose, the redemption payment or payment of Accreted Value will be deemed a principal payment and interest that is compounded and paid as Accreted Value will be deemed due on the scheduled redemption or payment date of such Capital Appreciation Bond;

(ii) if any of the Outstanding Series of Bonds constitute Balloon Indebtedness or Balloon Indebtedness and Variable Rate Indebtedness or if Bonds then proposed to be issued would constitute Balloon Indebtedness or Balloon Indebtedness and Variable Rate Indebtedness, then, for purposes of determining Maximum Annual Debt Service, such amounts as constitute Balloon Indebtedness will be treated as if the principal amount of such Bonds were to be amortized from the date of their original issuance in substantially equal annual installments of principal and interest over a term of 25 years; the interest rate used for such computation will be the rate quoted in *The Bond Buyer –25 Revenue Bond Index* for the last week of the month preceding the date of calculation, as published in *The Bond Buyer*, or if that index is no longer published, another similar index selected by the Commission, or if the Commission fails to select a replacement index, an interest rate equal to 80% of the yield for outstanding United States Treasury bonds having an equivalent maturity as the Bonds on the date of issuance, or if there are no such Treasury bonds having equivalent maturities, 80% of the lowest prevailing prime rate of any of the five largest commercial banks in the United States ranked by assets;

(iii) if any Outstanding Bonds constitute Tender Indebtedness or if Bonds then proposed to be issued would constitute Tender Indebtedness, then for purposes of determining the amounts of principal and interest due in any Fiscal Year on such Bonds, the options or obligations of the owners of such Bonds to tender the same for purchase or payment prior to their stated maturity or maturities will be treated as a principal maturity occurring on the first date on which owners of such Bonds may or are required to tender such Bonds except that any such option or obligation to tender Bonds will be ignored and not treated as a principal maturity, if (1) such Bonds are rated in one of the two highest long-term rating categories (without reference to gradations such as "plus" or "minus") by Moody's and by S&P or such Bonds are rated in the highest short-term, note or commercial paper rating categories by Moody's and by S&P and (2) the obligation, if any, the Commission may have under a Letter of Credit Agreement with respect to such Bonds, other than its obligations on such Bonds, will either be subordinated to the obligation of the Commission on the Bonds or be incurred under the conditions and meeting the tests for the issuance of Additional Bonds set forth in the Indenture;

(iv) if any Outstanding Bonds constitute Variable Rate Indebtedness, the interest rate on such Bonds will be assumed to be 110% of the greater of (a) the daily average interest rate on such Bonds during the 12 months ending with the month preceding the date of calculation, or such shorter period that such Bonds have been Outstanding, or (b) the rate of interest on such Bonds on the date of calculation;

(v) if Bonds proposed to be issued will be Variable Rate Indebtedness, then such Bonds will be assumed to bear interest at the rate quoted in *The Bond Buyer –25 Revenue Bond Index* for the last week of the month preceding the date of sale of such additional Bonds, as published in *The Bond Buyer*, or if that index is no longer published, another similar index selected by the Commission, or if the Commission fails to select a replacement index, an interest rate equal to 80% of the yield for outstanding United States Treasury bonds having an equivalent maturity as the additional Bonds proposed to be issued, or if there are no such Treasury bonds having equivalent maturities, 80% of the lowest prevailing prime rate of the five largest commercial banks in the United States ranked by assets:

(vi) if moneys or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California have been deposited with and are held by the Trustee or another fiduciary to be used to pay principal and/or interest on specified Bonds, then the principal and/or interest to be paid from such moneys or Federal Securities or

general obligation bonds of the State of California or from the earnings thereon will be disregarded and not included in calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service.

The term "Annual Debt Service" means the sum of such principal and interest as computed for the twelve-month period ending June 30 to which reference is made.

The term "Debt Service" means the sum of all such principal and interest.

The term "Average Annual Debt Service" means total Debt Service, divided by the number of twelve-month periods ending on June 30 (including any fractional periods) remaining until the last maturity date of any Outstanding Bond.

For the purpose of calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, and Average Annual Debt Service, in determining the amount of interest coming due during any twelve-month period ending June 30 on any Series of Bonds that were issued as Build America Bonds, such amount will be reduced by an amount equal to the Refundable Credits the Commission is scheduled to receive during each such twelve-month period ending June 30. If the amount of Refundable Credits scheduled to be received by the Commission for any Series of Bonds that were issued as Build America Bonds is reduced or otherwise not received during any twelve-month period ending June 30, the Commission will calculate the amount of interest due on such Series of Bonds for the subsequent twelve month period ending June 30 by offsetting against the gross amount of interest payable on such Series only the amount of the Refundable Credits scheduled to be received under Federal legislation (or other Federal regulation, pronouncement or action) authorizing the reduction of Refundable Credits.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the definitions of "Maximum Annual Debt Service," "Annual Debt Service," and "Average Annual Debt Service" above will be amended as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Definitions" below.

Mayor

The term "Mayor" means the Mayor of the City from time to time.

Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments

The term "Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments" means the aggregate amounts required by the Indenture and any subsequent Supplemental Indenture or Supplemental Indentures to be deposited in Sinking Fund Accounts for the payment of Term Bonds.

Moody's

The term "Moody's" means Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, and its successors and assigns, except that if such corporation will be dissolved or liquidated or will no longer perform the functions of a securities rating agency, then the term "Moody's" will be deemed to refer to any other nationally recognized securities rating agency selected by the Commission and approved by the Trustee.

Municipal Bond Insurer

The term "Municipal Bond Insurer" means any insurance company or companies which has or have issued a policy of municipal bond insurance insuring payment of the principal of and interest on any of the Bonds of any Series or a Bond Reserve Fund Policy and are so designated as such in the Indenture or a Supplemental Indenture.

Net Revenues

The term "Net Revenues" means all of the Revenues (but not including interest on investment of funds required to be deposited in said funds or investment earnings required to be deposited in the Improvement Fund) less all Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise (but not including such Operation and Maintenance Costs as are scheduled to be paid by the Commission from moneys other than Revenues, such moneys to be clearly available for such purpose).

Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise

The term "Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise" means the reasonable and necessary costs of operating and maintaining the Enterprise, calculated on sound accounting principles, including (among other things) salaries and wages, fees for services, costs of materials, supplies and fuel, reasonable expenses of management, legal fees, accounting fees, repairs and other expenses necessary to maintain and preserve the Enterprise in good repair and working order, and reasonable amounts for administration, overhead, insurance, taxes (if any), other similar costs, and the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the Commission may establish or the Board of Supervisors may require with respect to employees of the Commission, as provided in the Charter, but excluding in all cases (i) depreciation and obsolescence charges or reserves therefor, (ii) amortization of intangibles or other bookkeeping entries of a similar nature, (iii) costs of capital additions, replacements, betterments, extensions or improvements to the Enterprise, which under generally accepted accounting principles are chargeable to a capital account or to a reserve for depreciation, and (iv) charges for the payment of principal and interest on any general obligation bonds, revenue bonds or other indebtedness heretofore or hereafter issued for Enterprise purposes.

Opinion of Counsel

The term "Opinion of Counsel" means a written opinion of counsel (who may be counsel for the City or the Commission) retained by the Commission and who is acceptable to the Trustee. If and to the extent required by the provisions of the Indenture, each Opinion of Counsel will include the statements provided for in the Indenture.

Outstanding

The term "Outstanding," when used as of any particular time with reference to Bonds, means (subject to the provisions of the Indenture) all Bonds theretofore executed, issued and delivered by the Commission under the Indenture except –

(1) Bonds cancelled by the Trustee or surrendered to the Trustee for cancellation;

(2) Bonds for the payment or redemption of which funds or securities in the necessary amount (as set forth in the Indenture) will have theretofore been deposited with a fiduciary (whether upon or prior to the maturity or redemption date of such Bonds), provided that, if such Bonds are to be redeemed prior to the maturity thereof, notice of such redemption will have been given as in the Indenture provided or provision satisfactory to the Trustee will have been made for the giving of such notice; and

(3) Bonds in lieu of or in substitution for which other Bonds have been executed, issued and delivered by the Commission pursuant to the Indenture.

For purposes of this definition and within the meaning of the Indenture, Bonds the principal of or interest on which has been paid by a Municipal Bond Insurer will not be deemed paid by or on behalf of the Commission, will not be defeased and will remain Outstanding under the Indenture until paid by the Commission.

Parity State Loans

The term "Parity State Loans" means those loan agreements or installment sale agreements entered into between the Commission and the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof) to finance additions,

betterments, extensions, repairs, renewals or replacements to the Enterprise, which, by their terms, are payable from Revenues on a parity basis with debt service on the Bonds.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, all references to the term "Parity State Loans" in the Indenture shall be deemed to refer to "Parity Loans," such term having the definition described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Definitions" below.

Payment Date

The term "Payment Date" means any interest, or interest and principal, payment date on which payment of the principal of or interest on the Bonds is due or on which any Term Bonds are required to be redeemed from any Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments.

Permitted Investments

The term "Permitted Investments" means any of the following:

(1) United States Treasury notes, bonds, bills, or certificates of indebtedness, or obligations for which the faith and credit of the United States of America are pledged for the payment of principal and interest (including obligations issued or held in book-entry form on the books of the Department of the Treasury of the United States of America and securities which represent an undivided interest in such direct obligations), and also any securities now or hereafter authorized, both the principal of and interest on which is guaranteed directly by the full faith and credit of the United States of America;

(2) Bonds, consolidated bonds, collateral trust debentures, consolidated debentures or other obligations issued by federal land banks or federal intermediate credit banks established under the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; debentures and consolidated debentures issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives and banks for cooperatives established under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended; bonds or debentures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board established under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and bonds of any federal home loan bank established under said act; bonds, debentures, participation certificates or other obligations of the Government National Mortgage Association or the Federal National Mortgage Association established under the National Housing Act, as amended; and also any securities now or hereafter authorized, both the principal of and interest on which is guaranteed indirectly by the full faith and credit of the United States of America;

(3) Time certificates of deposit or negotiable certificates of deposit issued by a state or nationally chartered bank or trust company, including the Trustee, or a state or federal savings and loan association, provided that such certificates of deposit will be (i) continuously and fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or (ii) issued by any bank or trust company organized under the laws of any state of the United States, or any national banking association (including the Trustee), having a combined capital and surplus of at least $100,000,000, and such certificates will have maturities of six months or less, or (iii) continuously and fully secured by such securities as are described in clauses (1) or (2) above, which securities will have a market value (exclusive of accrued interest) at all times at least equal to the principal amount of such certificates of deposit;

(4) Bankers' acceptances which are issued by a bank or trust company organized under the laws of any state of the United States or any national banking association (including the Trustee) rated "A" or higher by Moody's and S&P; provided, that such banker's acceptances may not exceed 270 days' maturity;

(5) Any repurchase agreement with any bank or trust company organized under the laws of any state of the United States or any national banking association (including the Trustee) or government bond dealer reporting to, trading with and recognized as a primary dealer by, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which agreement is secured by any one or more of the securities described in clauses (1) or (2) above, provided the underlying securities are required by the repurchase agreement to be held by any such bank,

trust company or primary dealer having a combined capital and surplus of at least $100,000,000 and being independent of the issuer of such repurchase agreement, and provided the securities are continuously maintained at a market value of not less than the amount so invested;

(6) Commercial paper of "prime" quality of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and numerical rating as provided by Moody's and S&P, which commercial paper is limited to issuing corporations that are organized and operating within the United States of America and that have total assets in excess of five hundred million ($500,000,000) and that have an "A" or higher rating for the issuer's debentures, other than commercial paper, as provided by Moody's and S&P; provided that purchases of eligible commercial paper may not exceed one hundred eighty (180) days' maturity nor represent more than ten percent (10%) of the outstanding commercial paper of an issuer corporation;

(7) Bonds, notes, warrants or other evidence of indebtedness of any of the states of the United States or of any political subdivision or public agency thereof which are rated in one of the two highest short-term or long-term rating categories by Moody's and S&P;

(8) Any investment agreement with (i) any bank or trust company organized under the laws of any state of the United States of America or any national banking association (including the Trustee) or government bond dealer reporting to, trading with and recognized as a primary dealer by, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, having a combined capital and surplus of at least $100,000,000, or (ii) any corporation, limited liability company or other entity that is organized and operating within the United States of America and that has total assets in excess of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000) and (A) at the time the investment agreement is entered into, has an "A" or higher rating for its debt, other than commercial paper, as provided by Moody's and S&P, or (B) at the time the investment agreement is entered into, the investment agreement or the provider's obligations under the investment agreement are guaranteed by any entity with an "A" or higher rating for its debt, other than commercial paper, or for its financial strength, as provided by Moody's and S&P; and

(9) Government money market portfolios or money market funds restricted to obligations issued or guaranteed as to payment of principal and interest by the full faith and credit of the United States of America, which portfolios, unless held by the Trustee for 5 business days or less, have a rating at least equal to the lowest then existing rating on the Bonds given by S&P and Moody's.

Policy Costs

The term "Policy Costs" means the amounts owing to a Reserve Provider, including the principal amount of any draw on a Bond Reserve Fund Policy, interest thereon and reasonable expenses incurred by the Reserve Provider in enforcing payment of Policy Costs, as more fully set forth in the agreement pursuant to which such Bond Reserve Fund Policy is issued.

President

The term "President" means the President of the Commission from time to time.

Project

The term "Project" means any additions, enlargements, betterments, extensions and other improvements to or benefiting, and the equipping of, the Enterprise, including, without limitation, the acquisition of land therefor.

Project Fund

The term "Project Fund" means each fund by the name established within the Improvement Fund.

Proportionate Basis

The term "Proportionate Basis" when used with respect to the redemption of Bonds, means that the amount of Bonds of each maturity to be redeemed will be determined as nearly as practicable by multiplying the total amount of funds available for redemption by the ratio which the amount of Bond Obligation of Bonds of such maturity bears to the amount of all Bond Obligation of Bonds to be redeemed, provided that if the amount available for redemption of Bonds of any maturity is insufficient to redeem a multiple of $5,000 principal amount or Accreted Value payable at maturity, such amount will be applied to the redemption of the highest possible integral multiple (if any) of $5,000 principal amount or Accreted Value payable at maturity. For purposes of the foregoing, Term Bonds will be deemed to mature in the years and in the amounts of the Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments and Capital Appreciation Bonds and Current Interest Bonds maturing or subject to Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments in the same year will be treated as separate maturities. When used with respect to the payment or purchase of Bonds, "Proportionate Basis" will have the same meaning set forth above except that "pay" or "purchase" will be substituted for "redeem" or "redemption" and "paid" or "purchased" will be substituted for "redeemed."

Proposition A of 2002, Proposition A

The term "Proposition A of 2002" or "Proposition A" means a measure approved by a majority of voters voting thereon at a duly called and held revenue bond election on November 5, 2002, authorizing the issuance by the Commission of its revenue bonds or other forms of revenue financing in a principal amount not to exceed $1,628,000,000 to finance the acquisition and construction of improvements to the Enterprise.

Proposition E of 2002, Proposition E

The term "Proposition E of 2002" or "Proposition E" means a measure approved by a majority of voters voting thereon at a duly called and held revenue bond election on November 5, 2002 authorizing the issuance by the Commission of its revenue bonds or other forms of revenue financing for the purpose of reconstructing, replacing, expanding, repairing or improving water facilities or clean water facilities or combinations of water and clean water facilities under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Qualified Bank

The term "Qualified Bank" means a state or national bank or trust company or savings and loan association or a foreign bank with a domestic branch or agency which is organized and in good standing under the laws of the United States or any state thereof or any foreign country, which has a capital and surplus of $25,000,000 or more and which has a short term debt rating of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and numerical rating as provided by Moody's or by S&P.

Qualified Independent Consultant

The term "Qualified Independent Consultant" means a person or a firm who or which engages in the business of advising the management of public agencies concerning the operation and financing of public utilities, including public water supply, storage and distribution systems, and also including advice and consultation generally concerning the use and operation of public utilities, including public water supply, storage and distribution systems, and which person or firm, by reason of his or its knowledge and experience, has acquired a reputation as a recognized consultant. Such Qualified Independent Consultant may include a person or firm rendering professional engineering or accounting services in addition to his or its occupation as a public utility consultant and may include any person or firm regularly employed by the City or the Commission as a consultant to the City or the Commission.

Rebate Certificate

The term "Rebate Certificate" means the Rebate Certificate or similar tax certificate delivered or to be delivered by the Commission at the time of issuance and delivery of a Series of Bonds, as the same may be amended or supplemented in accordance with its terms.

Rebate Fund

The term "Rebate Fund" means the fund established and so designated for a Series of Bonds.

Refundable Credits

The term "Refundable Credits" means (a) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds under Section 54AA of the Code, the amounts which are payable by the Federal government under Section 6431 of the Code, which the Commission has elected to receive under Section 54AA(g)(1) of the Code, and (b) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds under any other provisions of the Code that creates, in the determination of the Commission, a substantially similar direct-pay subsidy program, the amounts which are payable by the Federal government under the applicable provisions of the Code, which the Commission has elected to receive under the applicable provisions of the Code.

Required Reserve

The term "Required Reserve" means,

(1) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued prior to the Effective Date, the aggregate amount which is equal to the sum of fifty percent (50%) of the Maximum Annual Debt Service on such Series of Bonds then Outstanding; provided, however, that such Required Reserve or a portion thereof may be provided by one or more Bond Reserve Fund Policies; provided further that in no event will the Commission, in connection with issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, be obligated to deposit an amount in the Bond Reserve Fund which is in excess of the amount permitted by the applicable provisions of the Code to be so deposited from the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds without having to restrict the yield of any investment purchased with any portion of such deposit.

(2) with respect to a Series of Bonds issued on or after the Effective Date, as of any date of calculation, the amount, if any, required to be deposited into a Reserve Account for that Series of Bonds, as defined in and provided by the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which such Series of Bonds is issued; provided, however, that in no event will the Commission, in connection with issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, be obligated to deposit an amount in the Bond Reserve Fund which is in excess of the amount permitted by the applicable provisions of the Code to be so deposited from the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds without having to restrict the yield of any investment purchased with any portion of such deposit.

Reserve Account

The term "Reserve Account" means each account established in the Bond Reserve Fund with respect to each Series of Bonds issued under the Indenture.

Reserve Provider

The term "Reserve Provider" means the issuer of a Bond Reserve Fund Policy.

Revenue Fund

The term "Revenue Fund" means the fund by that name established pursuant to the Indenture.

Revenues

The term "Revenues" means all gross revenues of the Enterprise, including all charges received for and all other income and receipts derived by the Commission or the City from the operation of the Enterprise, or arising from the Enterprise, including connection and installation charges, but excluding –

(1) any money received by or for the account of the City or the Commission from the levy or collection of taxes,

(2) moneys received from the State of California and the United States of America and required to be deposited in restricted funds,

(3) refundable deposits made to establish credit,

(4) advances and contributions made to the Commission or the City to be applied to construction,

(5) moneys required to be paid to the State of California and the United States of America pursuant to agreements with the City or the Commission,

(6) moneys received from insurance proceeds or the sale of or upon the taking by or under the threat of eminent domain of all or any part of the Enterprise (which moneys will be received and disposed of pursuant to the Indenture),

(7) proceeds from Bonds issued by the Commission or proceeds from loans obtained by the Commission,

(8) moneys or securities received by the City or the Commission as gifts or grants, the use of which is restricted by the donor or grantor,

(9) sewer service fees or charges, and

(10) any surcharge imposed by or upon the direction of any joint powers agency or other governmental entity, other than the Commission, the City or any department or agency of the City, whether or not collected by the Commission, the City or any department or agency of the City, for the purpose of financing improvements to the facilities comprising the Enterprise.

The term "Revenues" also includes (i) all interest, profits or other income derived from the deposit or investment of any moneys in any fund or account established under the Indenture (excluding any Rebate Fund and any escrow fund pledged for the payment of defeased bonds) or in any fund or account of the Enterprise and legally available to pay Debt Service on the Bonds, and (ii) any other moneys, proceeds and other amounts that the Commission determines should be "Revenues" under the Indenture.

Secretary

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Commission from time to time.

Series

The term "Series" means any series of Bonds executed, authenticated and delivered pursuant to the Indenture and identified as a separate Series of Bonds, including any Additional Bonds issued pursuant to a Supplemental Indenture and the Indenture.

Sinking Fund Accounts

The term "Sinking Fund Accounts" means any special account or accounts established by the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture or Indentures in the Principal Fund for the payment of Term Bonds.

S&P

The term "S&P" means Standard & Poor's Ratings Services, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, and its successors and assigns, except that if such corporation is dissolved or liquidated or will no longer performs the functions of a securities rating agency, then the term "S&P" will be deemed to refer to any other nationally recognized securities rating agency selected by the Commission and approved by the Trustee.

Supplemental Indenture

The term "Supplemental Indenture" means any indenture or resolution amendatory of or supplemental to the Indenture; but only if and to the extent that such Supplemental Indenture is specifically authorized under the Indenture.

Tender Indebtedness

The term "Tender Indebtedness" means any Bonds or portions of Bonds a feature of which is an option, on the part of the Bondowners, or an obligation, under the terms of such Bonds, to tender all or a portion of such Bonds to the Commission, the Trustee or other fiduciary or agent for payment or purchase and requiring that such Bonds or portions of Bonds be purchased if properly presented.

Treasurer

The term "Treasurer" means the Treasurer of the City and includes any deputy acting for the Treasurer.

Trustee

The term "Trustee" means U. S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, acting as an independent trustee with the duties and powers provided in the Indenture, its successors and assigns, and any other corporation or association which may at any time be substituted in its place, as provided in the Indenture.

2025 Series DEF Bonds

The term "2025 Series DEF Bonds" means the Commission's San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF issued pursuant to the Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, the Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture and Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture, amending and supplementing the Indenture.

Variable Rate Indebtedness

The term "Variable Rate Indebtedness" means any portion of indebtedness the interest rate on which is not fixed at the time of incurrence of such indebtedness, and has not at some subsequent date been fixed, at a single numerical rate for the entire term of the indebtedness.

Written Request of the Commission, Written Requisition of the Commission, Written Statement of the Commission

The terms "Written Request of the Commission," "Written Requisition of the Commission" and "Written Statement of the Commission" mean, respectively, a written request, requisition or statement signed by or on behalf of the Commission by the President or the General Manager or the Secretary or by any person (whether or not an officer of the Commission) who is specifically authorized by resolution of the Commission (which resolution will be provided to the Trustee) to sign or execute such a document on its behalf.

USE OF DEPOSITORY

(a) The 2025 Series DEF Bonds will be initially registered in the name of "Cede & Co.," as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York (the "Depository Trust Company"). Registered ownership of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds, or any portions thereof, may not thereafter be transferred except:

(i) to any successor of The Depository Trust Company or its nominee, or of any substitute depository designated pursuant to clause (ii) of this subsection (a) (a "Substitute Depository"); provided that any successor of The Depository Trust Company or Substitute Depository will be qualified under any applicable laws to provide the service proposed to be provided by it;

(ii) to any Substitute Depository not objected to by the Trustee, upon (1) the resignation of The Depository Trust Company or its successor (or any Substitute Depository or its successor) from its functions as depository, or (2) a determination by the Commission that The Depository Trust Company (or its successor) is no longer able to carry out its functions as depository; provided that any such Substitute Depository will be qualified under any applicable laws to provide the services proposed to be provided by it; or

(iii) to any person as provided below, upon (1) the resignation of The Depository Trust Company or its successor (or any Substitute Depository or its successor) from its functions as depository, or (2) a determination by the Commission to remove The Depository Trust Company or its successor (or Substitute Depository or its successor) from its functions as depository.

(b) In the case of any transfer pursuant to clause (i) or clause (ii) of subsection (a) above, upon receipt of all Outstanding 2025 Series DEF Bonds by the Trustee, together with a Written Request of the Commission to the Trustee designating the Substitute Depository, one new bond for each 2025 Series DEF Bond (as the case may be), which the Commission will prepare or cause to be prepared, will be executed and delivered for each maturity of 2025 Series DEF Bonds then Outstanding, registered in the name of such successor or such Substitute Depository, or their nominees, as the case may be, all as specified in such Written Request of the Commission. In the case of any transfer pursuant to clause (iii) of subsection (a) above, upon receipt of all Outstanding 2025 Series DEF Bonds by the Trustee, together with a Written Request of the Commission to the Trustee, new bonds for 2025 Series DEF Bonds, which the Commission will prepare or cause to be prepared in definitive form, will be executed and delivered in such denominations and registered in the names of such persons as are requested in such Written Request of the Commission, subject to the limitations of the Indenture, provided that the Trustee will not be required to deliver such new bonds for 2025 Series DEF Bonds within a period less than 60 days from the date of receipt of such Written Request from the Commission.

(c) In the case of a partial redemption or an advance refunding of any 2025 Series DEF Bonds evidencing a portion of the principal maturing in a particular year, The Depository Trust Company or its successor (or any Substitute Depository or its successor) will make an appropriate notation on such 2025 Series DEF Bonds indicating the date and amounts of such reduction in principal, in form acceptable to the Trustee. The Trustee will not be liable for such depository's failure to make such notations or errors in making such notations.

(d) The Commission and the Trustee will be entitled to treat the person in whose name any 2025 Series DEF Bonds is registered as the Owner thereof for all purposes of the Indenture and any applicable laws, notwithstanding any notice to the contrary received by the Trustee or the Commission; and the Commission and the Trustee will not have responsibility for transmitting payments to, communicating with, notifying, or otherwise dealing with any beneficial owners of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds. Neither the Commission nor the Trustee will have any responsibility or obligation, legal or otherwise, to any such beneficial owners or to any other party, including The Depository Trust Company or its successor (or Substitute Depository or its successor), except to the Owner of any 2025 Series DEF Bonds, and the Trustee may rely conclusively on its records as to the identity of the Owners of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Indenture and so long as all Outstanding 2025 Series DEF Bonds are registered in the name of Cede & Co. or its registered assigns, the Commission and the Trustee will

cooperate with Cede & Co., as sole registered Bondowner, and its registered assigns in effecting payment of the principal of and redemption premium, if any, and interest on the 2025 Series DEF Bonds by arranging for payment in such manner that funds for such payments are properly identified and are made available on the date they are due all in accordance with the Letter of Representations delivered by the Commission and the Trustee to The Depository Trust Company with respect to the 2025 Series DEF Bonds, the provisions of which the Trustee may rely upon to implement the foregoing procedures notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions set out in the Indenture.

BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS

Improvement Fund. The Commission has covenanted and agreed to maintain under the Indenture the separate fund known as the Improvement Fund. The Treasurer holds the amounts on deposit in the Improvement Fund. The Improvement Fund will be maintained and accounted for by the Controller so long as any moneys are on deposit in such Improvement Fund. The Commission may direct the Trustee to establish, within the Improvement Fund, separate Project Funds relating to separate Series of Bonds. Upon completion of the acquisition and construction of the Project, the Commission may direct the transfer of any remaining balance in the Improvement Fund to any other fund or account of the Commission.

The moneys in the Improvement Fund will be held by the Treasurer in trust and applied to the costs of acquisition, construction, expansion, improvement, financing and refinancing of the Project and the expenses incident thereto or connected therewith including, if necessary, interest to the extent permitted by law, reimbursement to the Commission for expenses incurred in connection with the Enterprise, architectural, engineering and inspection fees and expenses, apparatus, equipment and furnishings for the Enterprise, testing and inspection, surveys, insurance premiums, losses during construction not insured against because of deductible amounts, the fees and expenses of the Trustee, expenses in connection with the preparation, issuance, sale and delivery of the Bonds, legal, accounting and consultant fees and expenses, and similar expenses.

The Treasurer will pay out moneys from the Improvement Fund only upon warrants drawn by the Controller in the manner provided by law. No withdrawals will be made from the Improvement Fund for any purpose not authorized by law.

2025 Series DEF Costs of Issuance Fund. The Trustee will deposit a portion of the proceeds of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds in a separate fund to be known as the "2025 Series DEF Costs of Issuance Fund" which the Trustee agrees to establish and maintain. The money in the 2025 Series DEF Costs of Issuance Fund will be used and disbursed in the manner provided in the Indenture for the purpose of paying all costs of issuance incidental to or connected with the issuance of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds (or for making reimbursements to the Commission or any other person, firm or corporation for such costs theretofore paid by such person or it). Any balance of money remaining in the 2025 Series DEF Costs of Issuance Fund after the payment of all costs incidental to or connected with the issuance of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds or on the date set forth in the Indenture, whichever is earlier, will be transferred by the Trustee to the Commission, and the 2025 Series DEF Costs of Issuance Fund will be closed.

Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General. In addition to the Outstanding Bonds, the Commission may, subject to the requirements of the Law, by Supplemental Indenture establish one or more other Series of Bonds payable from Revenues on a parity with the Bonds and secured by a lien upon and pledge of Revenues equal to the lien and pledge securing the Bonds, and the Commission may issue and the Trustee may authenticate and deliver Bonds of any Series so established, in such principal amount and for such lawful purpose or purposes (including refunding of any Bonds issued under the Indenture and then Outstanding) as will be determined by the Commission in said Supplemental Indenture, but only upon compliance by the Commission with the provisions of the Indenture and subject to the following specific conditions, which are made conditions precedent to the issuance of any such additional Series of Bonds:

(a) The Commission will not be in default under the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture.

(b) The Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds will require that the Bond Reserve Fund to be established pursuant to the Indenture be increased, if and to the extent necessary, forthwith upon the receipt of the proceeds of the sale of such additional Series of Bonds

to an amount at least equal to the Required Reserve. Said deposit may be made from such proceeds or any other source, as provided in the Supplemental Indenture.

(c) The Bonds of such additional Series will be payable as to principal either semiannually on May 1 and November 1 of each year in which principal falls due or annually on November 1 of each year in which principal falls due, provided that Term Bonds of any Series will have a principal maturity date of November 1. The Bonds of such additional Series that are Current Interest Bonds will be payable as to interest semiannually on May 1 and November 1 of each year excepting the first year, provided that the first installment of interest may be payable on either May 1 or November 1 and will be for a period of not longer than twelve months and that the interest will be payable thereafter semiannually on May 1 and November 1, and further provided that interest on any Bonds constituting Parity State Loans, Variable Rate Indebtedness or Tender Indebtedness may be payable on such Payment Dates as will be specified in the loan agreement, installment sale agreement or Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of such Bonds.

(d) Fixed serial maturities or mandatory Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments, or any combination thereof, will be established in amounts sufficient to provide for the retirement of all of the Bonds of such additional Series on or before their respective maturity dates, unless such Bonds are Balloon Indebtedness.

(e) The aggregate principal amount of Bonds issued under the Indenture will not exceed any limitation imposed by law or by any Supplemental Indenture.

(f) The representations and estimates set forth in the certificates and written reports required by the Indenture can be made by the parties required to give such certificates and written reports.

(g) If then required by law, the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds must be approved by the qualified voters voting on a proposition to authorize the issuance of said Series of Bonds.

Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding. In addition to the Outstanding Bonds, the Commission may, subject to the requirements of the Law (including the provisions of any resolution or ordinance of the Board of Supervisors), by Supplemental Indenture establish one or more other Series of Bonds payable from Revenues on a parity with the Outstanding Bonds and secured by a lien upon and pledge of Revenues equal to the lien and pledge securing the Outstanding Bonds, and the Commission may issue, and the Trustee may authenticate and deliver Bonds of any Series so established, for the purpose of refunding any Bonds issued under the Indenture and then Outstanding, but only upon compliance by the Commission with the provisions of the Indenture, and subject to the following specific conditions, which are made conditions precedent to the issuance of any such additional Series of Bonds:

(a) The Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds will require that the Bond Reserve Fund to be established pursuant to the Indenture be increased, if necessary, forthwith upon the receipt of the proceeds of the sale of such additional Series of Bonds to an amount at least equal to the Required Reserve. Said deposit may be made from such proceeds or any other source, as provided in said Supplemental Indenture.

(b) The Bonds of such additional Series will be payable as to principal either semiannually on May 1 and November 1 of each year in which principal falls due or annually on November 1 of each year in which principal falls due, provided that Term Bonds of any Series will have a principal maturity date of November 1. The Bonds of such additional Series that are Current Interest Bonds will be payable as to interest semiannually on May 1 and November 1 of each year excepting the first year, provided that the first installment of interest may be payable on either May 1 or November 1 and will be for a period of not longer than twelve months and that the interest will be payable thereafter semiannually on May 1 and November 1, and further provided that interest on any Bonds constituting Variable Rate Indebtedness or Tender Indebtedness may be payable on such Payment Dates as will be specified in the Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of such Bonds.

(c) Fixed serial maturities or mandatory Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments, or any combination thereof, will be established in amounts sufficient to provide for the retirement of all of the Bonds of such additional Series on or before their respective maturity dates, unless such Bonds are Balloon Indebtedness.

(d) The aggregate principal amount of Bonds issued under the Indenture will not exceed any limitation imposed by law or by any Supplemental Indenture.

(e) The proceeds of the Bonds of such additional Series will be used, together with any other available moneys, to refund (by defeasance, current refunding or crossover refunding) all or a portion of the Bonds then Outstanding, and the Average Annual Debt Service for the Bonds of such additional Series (during the period from their issuance to their last maturity date) will be equal to or less than the Average Annual Debt Service on the Bonds to be refunded (during the period from the issuance of the additional Series to the last maturity date of the Bonds to be refunded.)

(f) The statements set forth in the certificate required by the Indenture can be made by the party required to give such certificate.

(g) If then required by law, the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds will have been approved by the qualified voters voting on a proposition to authorize the issuance of said Series of Bonds.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the provisions of the Indenture described in paragraphs (c) and (e) above will be amended and restated in their entirety as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding" below.

Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds. Whenever the Commission will determine to issue an additional Series of Bonds pursuant to the Indenture, the Commission will execute or adopt a Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds, specifying the maximum principal amount of Bonds of such Series and prescribing the terms and conditions of such additional Series of Bonds, including the terms and conditions of any Letter of Credit Agreement with respect to the Letter of Credit securing such additional Series of Bonds, if any.

Such Supplemental Indenture will prescribe the form or forms of Bonds of such additional Series and, subject to the provisions of the Indenture, will provide for the distinctive designation, denominations, methods of execution and numbering, dating, maturity dates, interest rates, interest payment dates, provisions for redemption prior to maturity and methods and places of payment of principal and interest.

The Commission may by such Supplemental Indenture prescribe any other provisions respecting the Bonds of such Series not inconsistent with the terms of the Indenture, including registration, transfer and exchange provisions, provisions for the payment of principal and interest and sinking fund provisions.

Before such additional Series of Bonds will be issued and delivered, the Commission will file the following documents with the Trustee:

(a) An Opinion of Counsel setting forth (1) that such counsel has examined the Supplemental Indenture and found it to be in compliance with the requirements of the Indenture; (2) that the execution and delivery of the additional Series of Bonds have been sufficiently and duly authorized by the Commission; and (3) that said additional Series of Bonds, when duly executed by the Commission and, if required, authenticated and delivered by the Trustee, will be valid and binding special obligations of the Commission, payable from Revenues as provided in the Indenture.

(b) If such additional Series of Bonds are being issued pursuant to the Indenture, a Certificate of the Commission that the requirement of (a) under "Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General" has been met.

(c) The required certificates and reports under subparagraph (1) or (2) below:

(1) If the additional Series of Bonds are being issued pursuant to the requirements set forth under "Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General" (see above), the following certificates:

(A) A Certificate of the Commission setting forth (i) for any period of 12 consecutive calendar months out of the 18 calendar months next preceding the authentication and delivery of such Series of Bonds, the Net Revenues for such 12-month period, and (ii) the Debt Service for such 12-month period, and demonstrating that for such 12-month period Net Revenues equaled at least 1.25 times Debt Service;

(B) If any portion of the proceeds of such Series of Bonds is to be used to finance construction, a certificate of the Consulting Engineers setting forth (i) the estimated date of completion for the portion of the Project for which such Series of Bonds is being issued and for any other uncompleted portion of the Project, and (ii) an estimate of the cost of construction of such portion of the Project and of any other uncompleted portion of the Project;

(C) A written report of a Qualified Independent Consultant setting forth for each of the next three Fiscal Years, or if any portion of the proceeds of such Series of Bonds is to be used to finance construction, the three Fiscal Years following the Fiscal Year in which the Consulting Engineers estimate such portion of the Project will be completed, estimates of (i) Revenues, (ii) Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise and (iii) Net Revenues; and

(D) A Certificate of the Commission setting forth (i) the estimates of Net Revenues, as set forth in the written report of the Qualified Independent Consultant pursuant to paragraph (C) above, for each of such three Fiscal Years, (ii) the Annual Debt Service for each of such three Fiscal Years, including Annual Debt Service as estimated in such Certificate of the Commission with respect to future Series of Bonds, if any, which such Certificate of the Commission will estimate (based on the estimate of the Consulting Engineers of the cost of construction of such portion of the Project and other uncompleted portions of the Project) will be required to complete payment of the cost of construction of such portion of the Project and any other uncompleted portion of the Project, and demonstrating that the estimated Net Revenues in each of the Fiscal Years set forth in (i) above is at least equal to 1.25 times the Annual Debt Service for the corresponding Fiscal Year as set forth in (ii) above.

Said certificate or certificates or written report will be filed after the sale of the additional Series of Bonds proposed to be issued (but prior to the delivery thereof and receipt of payment therefor), and will, respect to such additional Series of Bonds, be based upon the actual interest rate or rates determined at the time of sale thereof.

(2) If the additional Series of Bonds are being issued pursuant to the requirements set forth under "Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding" (see above), a certificate of an Independent Certified Public Accountant that the requirements stated under (e) under such caption have been met. Said certificate will be filed after the sale of the additional Series of Bonds proposed to be issued (but prior to the delivery thereof and receipt of payment therefor), and will, with respect to such additional Series of Bonds, be based upon the actual interest rate or rates determined at the time of sale thereof.

(d) The Supplemental Indenture, duly executed or certified and approved by the Trustee.

Upon the delivery to the Trustee of the foregoing instruments, the Trustee will authenticate and deliver the additional Series of Bonds, in the aggregate principal amount specified in such Supplemental Indenture, to, or upon the Written Request of the Commission, when such additional Series of Bonds will have been presented to it for that purpose.

None of the limitations or restrictions on the issuance of additional Series of Bonds described under this caption "Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds" will be applicable to any additional Series of Bonds which are to be issued solely for the purpose of refunding and retiring all of the Bonds issued pursuant to the Indenture and then Outstanding, and nothing contained in the Indenture will limit the issuance of any additional Series of Bonds if, after the issuance and delivery of such additional Series of Bonds, none of the Bonds theretofore authorized pursuant to the Indenture will be Outstanding or the Commission will have discharged the entire indebtedness on all Bonds Outstanding pursuant to the defeasance provisions of the Indenture.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the provision of the Indenture described in paragraph (c)(1) above will be amended and restated in its entirety as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds" below.

Consent Required for Other Issuances of Additional Bonds. So long as any of the Bonds remain Outstanding, the Commission will not issue any Additional Bonds or obligations payable from Revenues on a parity with the Bonds except pursuant to the provisions of the Indenture described above under the captions "Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General," "Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding," or "Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds," *except* under any of the following conditions, in which case none of the limitations or restrictions on the issuance of additional Series of Bonds described under the foregoing captions shall be applicable, except as set forth below:

(a) if the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation and any Credit Provider consent in writing to the issuance of such Additional Bonds or obligations; or

(b) the obligation constitutes debt of the Commission (including without limitation loan agreements and installment sale agreements entered into between the Commission and the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof) to finance or refinance additions, betterments, extensions, repairs, renewals or replacements to the Enterprise) payable by its terms from Revenues on a subordinate basis to the payment of Debt Service on the Bonds.

In addition, the Commission may enter into Parity State Loans if (i) no Event of Default has occurred and is continuing under the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture (and no event has occurred which, but for the passage of time or the giving of notice, would constitute an Event of Default under the Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture); (ii) the payment of Parity State Loan principal and interest shall meet the requirements of the provisions of the Indenture described in paragraph (c) under the heading "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS--Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General"; and (iii) in connection with the execution and delivery of such Parity State Loans, the Commission delivers the certificates set forth in the provisions of the Indenture described in paragraph (c)(1) under the heading "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS-- Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds; General," taking into account that for purposes of such provisions the reference to "Series of Bonds" includes Parity State Loans.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the provision of the Indenture described in the paragraph immediately above will be amended and restated in its entirety as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Consent Required for Other Issuances of Additional Bonds" below.

REVENUES AND FUNDS

Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund. (a) In accordance with the Charter, but subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of the Charter, whenever revenue bonds issued by the Commission pursuant to the Charter or refunding bonds of such revenue bonds are Outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Enterprise will be set aside and deposited into a fund in the City treasury heretofore established and known as the "Enterprise Revenue Fund" (the "Revenue Fund"). All amounts paid into such fund will be maintained by the Treasurer separate and apart from all other City funds and will be secured by the Treasurer's official bond or bonds.

(b) Moneys in the Revenue Fund, including earnings thereon, will be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Enterprise and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the Commission and only in accordance with the following priority:

(1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities;

(2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the Commission may establish or the Board of Supervisors may require with respect to employees of the Commission;

(3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness (including, Parity State Loans), hereafter issued by the Commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of the Enterprise or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the Commission as provided in the Indenture;

(4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds issued by the City for Enterprise purposes;

(5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the Commission or as required by any Enterprise revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved;

(6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the Commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the Commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to the Charter.

(c) Subject to the provisions of subsection (a) and (b) above, all of the Revenues (except amounts on deposit in the Rebate Fund) are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of the principal of and interest and redemption premium, if any, on the Bonds and the Policy Costs, and the Revenues will not be used for any other purpose while any of the Bonds remain Outstanding or Policy Costs remain unpaid; except that the Revenues may be used for such purposes as are expressly permitted in the Charter and in the Indenture. Pursuant to Section 5451 of the California Government Code, such pledge will constitute a lien on and security interest in the Revenues for the payment of the Bonds and the Policy Costs in accordance with the terms thereof and of the Indenture, and will immediately attach to the collateral and be effective, binding, and enforceable against the Commission, its successors, purchasers of the Revenues, creditors and all others asserting any rights thereto, irrespective of whether such parties have notice of such pledge and without the need for any physical delivery, recordation, filing or further act.

(d) The Commission covenants and confirms that the Revenues in the Revenue Fund shall be appropriated, transferred, expended and used as set forth above in paragraph (b) under this caption "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" and in the order of priority set forth subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such paragraph, notwithstanding any amendment to the Charter. The Commission further confirms that all Revenues (except amounts on deposit in the various Rebate Funds) are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of the principal of and interest and redemption premium, if any, on the Bonds and the Policy Costs, and the Revenues shall not be used for any other purpose while any of the Bonds remain outstanding or Policy Costs remain unpaid; except

that the Revenues may be used for such purposes as are expressly set forth above in paragraph (b) under this caption "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" and, as long as the Commission is in compliance with its rate covenant under the Indenture and the deposits required as described below under the caption "Establishment and Maintenance of Funds for Revenues; Use and Withdrawal of Revenues," as otherwise set forth in the Charter and in the Indenture. Amendments to the Charter shall not alter the pledge of Revenues or the order of priority of payment of the Revenues used for the payment of principal of and interest on the Bonds.

Establishment and Maintenance of Funds for Revenues; Use and Withdrawal of Revenues. All moneys in the Revenue Fund, after the making of the payments described in subsections (b)(1) and (2) in "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" above, shall, on a parity basis be (i) paid over to the Trustee to the extent necessary and deposited in one or more of the following respective special funds at the times therein specified, and (ii) used as needed for the payment of Parity State Loans. The Trustee shall establish and maintain, in trust, for the benefit of and so long as any Bonds, other than Parity State Loans, are Outstanding the Interest Fund, Principal Fund, and Bond Reserve Fund.

All Revenues in each of said funds shall be held in trust by the Trustee and shall be applied, used and withdrawn only for the purposes authorized in the Indenture. Such amounts shall be so transferred to and deposited in the following respective funds in the following order of priority, the requirements of each such fund at the time of deposit to be satisfied before any transfer is made to any fund subsequent in priority:

(a) Interest Fund, Refundable Credits. On or before the fifth Business Day prior to each Interest Payment Date, the Treasurer will pay to the Trustee for deposit in the Interest Fund in an amount equal to the sum of the following: (i) the amount of interest becoming due and payable on the Outstanding Bonds of such Series that are Current Interest Bonds (except for Bonds constituting Variable Rate Indebtedness) on such Interest Payment Date (less any amounts on deposit in such Fund, including, but not limited to, Refundable Credits available to pay such interest, but excluding amounts on deposit which are reserved as capitalized interest to pay interest during any subsequent period), and (ii) one hundred ten percent (110%) of the estimated aggregate amount of interest due on such Interest Payment Date on the Outstanding Bonds of such Series that are Variable Rate Indebtedness (provided, however, that (A) the amount of such deposit into the Interest Fund for any period may be reduced by the amount by which the deposit in the prior period for interest estimated to accrue on Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness exceeded the actual amount of interest accrued during that period on said Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness, (B) the amount of such deposit into the Interest Fund for any period will be increased by the amount by which the deposit in the prior period for interest estimated to accrue on Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness was less than the actual amount of interest accruing during that period on said Outstanding Variable Rate Indebtedness, and (C) the amount of such deposit will be reduced by any Refundable Credits on deposit in the Interest Fund and available to pay interest for such period). No deposit need be made into the Interest Fund if the amount contained therein is at least equal to the interest to become due and payable on the next Interest Payment Date upon all of the Bonds issued under the Indenture and then Outstanding (but excluding any moneys on deposit in the Interest Fund from the proceeds of any Series of Bonds or other source and reserved as capitalized interest to pay interest on any future Interest Payment Dates following said next Interest Payment Date). Moneys in the Interest Fund will be used and withdrawn by the Trustee solely for the purpose of paying the interest on the Bonds as it will become due and payable (including accrued interest on any Bonds purchased or redeemed prior to maturity pursuant to the Indenture).

All of the Refundable Credits received by the Commission will be deposited promptly upon receipt in the Interest Fund, and such Refundable Credits are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of principal of, interest and redemption premium, if any, on the related Series of Bonds, and, unless an Event of Default shall occur under the Indenture and the provisions of the Indenture relating to the application of funds upon acceleration shall apply, the Refundable Credits will not be used for any other purpose while any of such Series of Bonds issued as Build America Bonds remain Outstanding. Pursuant to Section 5451 of the California Government Code, the pledge of the Indenture constitutes a lien on and security interest in the Refundable Credits for the payment of interest on the related Series of Bonds in accordance with the terms thereof and the terms of the Indenture, and will immediately attach and be effective, binding, and enforceable against the Commission, its successors, purchasers of the Refundable Credits, creditors and all others asserting any rights thereto, irrespective of whether such parties have notice of such pledge and without the need for any physical delivery, recordation, filing or further act.

Notwithstanding the foregoing deposit and pledge, (a) the Refundable Credits shall not be included in the calculation of Revenues if the Refundable Credits have been used in any calculation as a reduction (or credit) against the interest payable under the Indenture (or in any other calculation that would double-count a Refundable Credit), and (b) if the Federal Government is paying less than the amount scheduled to be paid by the Federal Government pursuant to Section 6431 of the Code or pursuant to any similar direct-pay subsidy program (due to sequestration or otherwise), then Refundable Credits may be included in the calculation of Revenues but only to the extent such Refundable Credits are required or permitted to be made pursuant to Federal law. Additionally, in calculating the amount that the Treasurer pays to the Trustee for deposit in the Interest Fund, the Treasurer may reduce the payment by the amount of any Refundable Credits on deposit with the Trustee as provided in the paragraph above.

(b) Principal Fund; Sinking Fund Accounts. On or before the fifth Business Day prior to each Principal Payment Date, the Treasurer will pay to the Trustee for deposit in the Principal Fund in an amount equal to the sum of the following: (i) the aggregate amount of Bond Obligation of such Series (less any amounts on deposit in such Fund) becoming due and payable on such Principal Payment Date, plus (ii) the Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments required to be made with respect to any Term Bonds of such Series on such Principal Payment Date, plus (iii) if any Letter of Credit Agreement has been entered into on a parity with the Bonds, sufficient amounts to pay the obligations of the Commission under such Letter of Credit Agreement due on such Principal Payment Date. If the amounts on deposit in the Principal Fund will be insufficient to make all deposits which are required to be made with respect to any Principal Payment Date, such amounts shall be applied on a Proportionate Basis and in such proportion as said Serial Bonds, said Minimum Sinking Fund Payments for Term Bonds, and said Letter of Credit Agreement obligations shall bear to each other.

(c) Bond Reserve Fund; Reserve Accounts.

(1) In the event of a withdrawal from any Reserve Account, the Treasurer will pay to the Trustee for deposit in such Reserve Account, on a *pari passu* basis with transfers to any other Reserve Account, on or before the fifth Business Day prior to each Interest Payment Date following such withdrawal, (i) if such Reserve Account is established with respect to fixed rate Bonds only, an amount which if made in two semi-annual installments, and (ii) if such Reserve Account is established with respect to any Variable Rate Bonds, an amount which if made in equal installments over a 12-month period, is sufficient to replenish any prior withdrawal from such Reserve Account so that the balance in such Reserve Account is equal to the Required Reserve with respect to the applicable Series of Bonds (or such larger balance as may be required by any Supplemental Indenture) at the end of such 12-month period.

(2) No deposit need be made into any Reserve Account so long as there will be in such Reserve Account an amount equal to the Required Reserve with respect to such Series of Bonds, or when and if the sum of the amounts contained (excluding all Bond Reserve Fund Policies) therein and in the Interest Fund and in the Principal Fund is at least equal to the sum of the aggregate principal amount of all of the Bonds then Outstanding and all of the interest then due or thereafter to become due on all such Bonds.

(3) Except as otherwise provided as described below, the Trustee will establish and hold within the Bond Reserve Fund a Reserve Account for each Series of Bonds issued under the Indenture. With respect to the Series of Bonds (the "Prior Series of Bonds") issued prior to the Effective Date of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture, each Reserve Account will be funded in an amount equal to fifty percent (50%) of the Maximum Annual Debt Service on the Outstanding Bonds of the Series to which it relates. With respect to the Series of Bonds issued on or after the Effective Date of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture, the Trustee will establish and hold a Reserve Account for each Series of Additional Bonds issued under the Indenture, if and to the extent required by the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which that Series of Bonds is issued. Upon the issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, there will be deposited into the Reserve Account for that Series an amount equal to the Required Reserve, if any, established for that Series of Bonds under the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which that Series of Bonds is issued. Upon the issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, the Commission will advise the Trustee of the Required Reserve to be maintained in the Reserve Account for that Series. Unless otherwise provided in the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which a Series of Bonds is issued, the Reserve Account established with respect to a Series of Bonds will be

available only to pay Debt Service on such Series of Bonds, and will not be available to pay Debt Service on any other Series of Bonds.

(4) Subject to paragraph (12) below, moneys in the respective Reserve Accounts within the Bond Reserve Fund will be used and withdrawn by the Trustee solely for the purpose of paying the principal of, Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments with respect to, and interest on the corresponding Series of Bonds to which such Reserve Account relates (unless otherwise provided in the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which a Series of Bonds was issued) in the event that no other moneys are available therefor, or for payment or redemption of all of the Bonds of such Series then Outstanding.

(5) Following application of all other funds held in any Reserve Account relating to a Series of Bonds, the Trustee will draw under any Bond Reserve Fund Policy issued with respect to such Series of Bonds, in a timely manner and pursuant to the terms of such Bond Reserve Fund Policy, to the extent necessary in order to obtain sufficient funds on or prior to the date such funds are needed to pay the Bond Obligation of, Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments with respect to, and interest on such Series of Bonds when due.

(6) If a Bond Reserve Fund Policy satisfies all or a portion of the Required Reserve for any Series of Bonds and a drawing is made on the Bond Reserve Fund Policy, on or before the fifth Business Day prior to each Interest Payment Date following such drawing, the Treasurer will pay to the Trustee or to the Reserve Provider, with notice to the Trustee, (i) if such Bond Reserve Fund Policy is established with respect to fixed rate Bonds only, an amount which if made in two semi-annual installments, and (ii) if such Bond Reserve Fund Policy is established with respect to any Variable Rate Bonds, an amount which if made in equal installments over a 12-month period, is sufficient to repay the aggregate amount of Policy Costs owing with respect to such drawing by the end of such 12-month period. If the Trustee receives such payment, it shall immediately remit the same to the Reserve Provider.

(7) In the event that the Trustee has notice that any payment of principal of or interest on a Bond has been recovered from its Bondowner pursuant to the United States Bankruptcy Code by a trustee in bankruptcy in accordance with the final, nonappealable order of a court having competent jurisdiction, the Trustee, pursuant to the terms of the Bond Reserve Fund Policy, if any, securing the Series of Bonds of which such Bond is a part, will so notify the Reserve Provider and draw on such policy to the lesser of the extent required or the maximum amount of such policy in order to pay to such Bondowners the principal of and interest so recovered.

(8) If and to the extent that more than one Bond Reserve Fund Policy satisfies the portion of the Required Reserve relating to a Series of Bonds, drawings under such Bond Reserve Fund Policies and payment of Policy Costs with respect to such Bond Reserve Fund Policies shall be made on a pro rata basis (calculated by reference to the maximum amounts of such Bond Reserve Fund Policies).

(9) If a Bond Reserve Fund Policy is deposited in a Reserve Account in which cash has been previously deposited in satisfaction of the Required Reserve for the applicable Series of Bonds, the trustee shall release cash from that Reserve Account in an amount equal to the Bond Reserve Fund Policy being deposited, and shall transfer the cash so released to the Commission to be used for any lawful purpose, provided, however, that the Commission shall ensure that the use of any cash so released will not adversely affect the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Bonds under Section 103 of the Code (if applicable).

(10) If deposits are insufficient to fully satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (5) above, deposits to the Bond Reserve Fund shall be applied on a pro rata basis to the respective Reserve Accounts, calculated by reference to the amounts required to be maintained in each Reserve Account, and within any Reserve Account first to the pro rata payment of Policy Costs and upon satisfaction of such Policy Costs to satisfying any portion of the Required Reserve to be maintained within such Reserve Account not covered by a Bond Reserve Fund Policy.

(11) So long as the Commission is not in default under the Indenture, and in each Reserve Account there is a balance equal to the Required Reserve for the Series of Bonds for which such Reserve Account was established, any amount in the Bond Reserve Fund in excess of the Required Reserve will be withdrawn semiannually, on May 1 and November 1 of each year, by the Trustee from the Bond Reserve Fund and transferred to the Treasurer for deposit in the Revenue Fund or, during the period of construction of the Project or any portion thereof, the Improvement Fund. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Commission will have the right to withdraw excess amounts on deposit in the Bond Reserve Fund at any time upon request to the Trustee.

(12) On and after the Effective Date, any Reserve Requirement established with respect to any Series of Bonds which are issued as Build America Bonds prior to such date may, at the option of the Commission, be recalculated in accordance with the provisions of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture.

(13) Nothing under the Indenture shall preclude the creation of a Reserve Account to secure one or more Series of Bonds issued subsequent to the Effective Date.

All moneys remaining in the Revenue Fund on the tenth day of each month (or on such earlier day of each month as the transfers required to the Interest Fund, Principal Fund, Sinking Fund Accounts and the Bond Reserve Fund will have been completed) and attributable to the preceding calendar month, after the setting aside and transferring of all of the amounts required to be set aside or transferred by the Treasurer by the provisions in the Indenture as required to the Interest Fund, Principal Fund, Sinking Fund Accounts and the Bond Reserve Fund, will be deposited by the Treasurer in accordance with the Charter. The inability of the Treasurer to make any deposit for any of the purposes described above in subparagraphs (4), (5), or (6) of paragraph (b) under the caption "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" by reason of a lack of Revenues available therefor will not constitute an Event of Default under the Indenture. If at any time any moneys so deposited are needed to pay the interest on or principal of the Bonds, or to pay Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise for the then current Fiscal Year for which no adequate budgeted amount was provided by the Commission, the Treasurer may transfer such moneys for such purpose. Any such transfer will be replenished from Revenues when moneys are available for deposit in the particular fund from which the transfer was made, after all required transfers to funds having a higher priority have been made.

The Treasurer shall not expend any moneys for any of the purposes specified in subparagraphs (4), (5), or (6) of paragraph (b) under the caption "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" if and when the Commission is in default in making any payment or deposit under the Indenture.

Deposit and Investment of Moneys in Funds; Interest Rate Swaps. All moneys held by the Treasurer in the Revenue Fund or the Improvement Fund, or for the purposes described above in subparagraphs (4), (5), or (6) of paragraph (b) under the caption "Pledge and Assignment of Revenues; Revenue Fund" may be invested in Legal Investments maturing not later than the date on which such moneys are required for payment by the Treasurer. All moneys held by the Trustee and allocated to any of the funds held by it, subject to the restrictions set forth in the Rebate Certificate, will be held in time or demand deposits (including certificates of deposit) in any bank or trust company (including the Trustee) authorized to accept deposits of public funds, and will be secured at all times by such obligations, and to the fullest extent, as is required by law, and may be invested in Permitted Investments, maturing not later than the date on which such moneys are required for payment by the Trustee, except that moneys in the Bond Reserve Fund may be deposited or invested in deposits or Permitted Investments which mature not more than seven years from the date of investment or the final date of maturity of the Outstanding Bonds, whichever is earlier. If at any time any of the investments stated to be Permitted Investments under the Indenture cease to be a legal investment for funds held under the Indenture, the Commission will so advise the Trustee by a Written Statement of the Commission. The Trustee will not be responsible for making any investment which is not a legal investment if the Commission will not have previously delivered a Written Request or Written Statement of the Commission correctly advising the Trustee that such investment was no longer a legal investment. For the purpose of determining the amount of money in the Bond Reserve Fund, all investments of moneys therein will be valued annually on October 31 at the market value of such investments. All interest received on any moneys so invested by the Treasurer or the Trustee will be deposited in and for the purpose of the Revenue Fund, except that all interest received on any moneys so invested in the Principal Fund or Interest Fund will remain in such fund, and further except that prior to receipt by the Trustee of notice of completion of construction of the Project or any portion thereof all interest received on any moneys

so invested in the Improvement Fund or in the Bond Reserve Fund will remain in, or be transferred to and deposited in, the Improvement Fund held by the Treasurer. Upon completion of construction of the Project or any such portion thereof, the Commission will file with the Trustee a Certificate or Written Statement of the Commission stating the fact and date of such completion of construction.

The Trustee may sell or present for redemption any obligations so purchased by it whenever it is necessary in order to provide moneys to meet any payment, and the Trustee will not be liable or responsible for any loss resulting from such investment.

The Trustee may act as principal or agent in the acquisition or disposition of any investment.

The Trustee may commingle any of the moneys held by it pursuant to the Indenture for investment purposes only; provided, however, that the Trustee will account separately for the moneys belonging to each fund or account established pursuant to the Indenture and held by it.

The Commission may and the Trustee will, upon the Written Request or Written Statement of the Commission, and provided that the Trustee is supplied with an Opinion of Counsel to the effect that such action is permitted under the laws of the State of California, enter into an interest rate swap agreement corresponding to the interest rate or rates payable on a Series of Bonds or any portion thereof and the amounts received by the Commission or the Trustee, if any, pursuant to such a swap agreement may be applied to the deposits required under the Indenture. The entity with which the Commission or the Trustee may contract for an interest rate swap is limited to entities that are rated in one of the two highest short-term or long-term debt rating categories by Moody's and S&P. If the Commission so designates, amounts payable under the interest rate swap agreement will be made on a parity basis with payments on the Bonds and, in such event, the Commission will pay to the Trustee for deposit in the Interest Fund, at the times and in the manner provided in the Indenture, the amounts to be paid under such interest rate swap agreement, as if such amounts were additional interest due on the Bonds to which such interest rate swap relates.

SELECTED COVENANTS OF THE COMMISSION

Payment of Principal and Interest. The Commission will punctually pay or cause to be paid the principal and interest (and premium, if any) to become due in respect of every Bond issued under the Indenture at the times and places and in the manner provided in the Indenture and in the Bonds, in strict conformity with the terms of the Bonds and of the Indenture, but solely from Revenues as provided in the Indenture.

Against Encumbrances. Subject to any rights of the United States of America or the State of California, the Commission will not mortgage or otherwise encumber, pledge or place any charge upon the Enterprise or any part thereof, or upon any of the Revenues, prior to or on a parity with the Bonds, provided that Letter of Credit Agreements entered into in connection with Balloon Indebtedness, Variable Rate Indebtedness or Tender Indebtedness may be payable on a parity with the Bonds.

So long as any Bonds are Outstanding, the Commission will not issue any bonds or obligations payable from Revenues or secured by a pledge, lien or charge upon Revenues prior to or on a parity with the Bonds, other than the Bonds, provided that Letter of Credit Agreements entered into in connection with Balloon Indebtedness, Variable Rate Indebtedness or Tender Indebtedness may be payable on a parity with the Bonds.

Nothing in the Indenture, and particularly nothing in the preceding two paragraphs, will prevent the Commission from authorizing and issuing bonds, notes, warrants, certificates or other obligations or evidences of indebtedness which as to principal or interest, or both, (1) are payable from Revenues after and subordinate to the payment from Revenues of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, or (2) are payable from moneys which are not Revenues as such term is defined in the Indenture.

Sale or Other Disposition of Property. The Commission will not sell or otherwise dispose of the Enterprise or any part thereof essential to the proper operation of the Enterprise or to the maintenance of the Revenues except as expressly permitted in the Indenture. The Commission will not enter into any lease or agreement which impairs the operation of the Enterprise or impedes the rights of the Owners of the Bonds with respect to the Revenues or the

operation of the Enterprise, but the Commission may enter into any lease or agreement concerning all or any part of the Enterprise if such lease or agreement will not impair the operation of the Enterprise or impede the rights of the Owners of the Bonds with respect to the Revenues or the operation of the Enterprise.

Any real or personal property which has become nonoperative or which is not needed for the efficient and proper operation of the Enterprise, or any material or equipment which has worn out, may be sold if all of the net proceeds of such sale (less any amounts payable to the United States of America or the State of California or required by the United States of America or the State of California to be deposited in a restricted fund) are deposited in the Revenue Fund.

The Commission reserves the right to sell all or a portion of the Enterprise, and to enter into and execute agreements for and to complete such sale, but subject to the following specific conditions, which are made conditions precedent to such sale:

(1) The Commission will be in compliance with all covenants set forth in the Indenture, and in all Supplemental Indentures theretofore adopted by the Commission, and a Certificate of the Commission to that effect will have been filed with the Trustee.

(2) The Commission will have determined by resolution whether the net proceeds of the sale (less any amounts payable to the United States of America or the State of California or required to be deposited in a restricted fund) are to be used for the redemption of Bonds or for the making of additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise.

(3) If the Commission will have determined that the net proceeds of the sale (less any amounts payable to the United States of America or the State of California or required to be deposited in a restricted fund) are to be used for the redemption of Bonds, such proceeds of the sale will be deposited with the Trustee, and the following conditions will have been satisfied:

(i) The Commission will have adopted a resolution providing for the redemption of the maximum principal amount of Bonds which can be redeemed from such proceeds of such sale, or, in the event that no Bonds are subject to redemption on the next succeeding interest payment date, directing the Trustee (A) to hold such proceeds in trust, (B) to invest such proceeds in the investments permitted by the Indenture until any Bonds become redeemable, subject to any restrictions imposed by the Indenture, (C) to deposit the interest and income on such proceeds in the Revenue Fund as such interest and income is received, and (D) to use such proceeds to redeem Bonds in the amount and manner specified in the Indenture and any Supplemental Indenture on the first interest payment date on which the Bonds can be redeemed; and a certified copy of such resolution will have been filed with the Trustee, along with a Written Request or Certificate of the Commission containing such direction.

(ii) If such proceeds are not to be immediately used for the redemption of Bonds but instead are to be held by the Trustee until Bonds become redeemable, the Commission will have filed with the Trustee a written report of an Independent Certified Public Accountant stating (A) the amount of proceeds to be deposited with the Trustee from such sale, (B) an estimate of the total amount of Bond Obligation and the amount of Bonds of each maturity which could be redeemed from such proceeds on the first interest payment date on which Bonds are redeemable, and (C) the estimated annual interest and income to be earned on such proceeds while held and invested by the Trustee. Such interest and income on such proceeds upon receipt by the Trustee will be deposited in the Revenue Fund and will be treated as Revenues for all purposes of the Indenture, including determining whether the Commission is in compliance with the rate covenant contained in the Indenture.

(iii) If such proceeds of such sale are to be immediately used to redeem Bonds, the Net Revenues for the last Fiscal Year or last recorded twelve-month period preceding the date of the adoption by the Commission of the resolution authorizing such sale, less a deduction for the portion

of such Net Revenues attributable to the portion of the Enterprise to be sold, all as shown by a certificate or opinion of an Independent Certified Public Accountant or a written report of a Qualified Independent Consultant, will have produced a sum equal to at least 1.25 times Maximum Annual Debt Service on the Bonds to be Outstanding following the redemption of Bonds from the proceeds of such sale.

(iv) (iv) If such proceeds are not to be immediately used for the redemption of Bonds but instead are to be held by the Trustee until Bonds become redeemable, the Net Revenues for the last Fiscal Year or last recorded twelve-month period preceding the date of adoption by the Commission of the resolution authorizing such sale, less a deduction for the portion of such Net Revenues attributable to the portion of the Enterprise to be sold, plus an allowance for the estimated annual interest or income to be earned on the invested proceeds of such sale while held and invested by the Trustee, all as shown by a certificate or opinion of an Independent Certified Public Accountant or a written report of a Qualified Independent Consultant, will have produced a sum equal to at least 1.25 times Maximum Annual Debt Service.

(4) If the Commission, will have determined that the net proceeds of the sale (less any amounts payable to the United States of America or the State of California or required to be deposited in a restricted fund) are to be used for the making of additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise, such proceeds of the sale will be deposited by the Treasurer in a special fund in trust to be held by the Treasurer to be used for the making of additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise, and the condition set forth in the following sentence will have been satisfied. The Net Revenues for the last Fiscal Year or last recorded twelve-month period preceding the date of the adoption by the Commission of the resolution authorizing such sale, less a deduction for the portion of such Net Revenues attributable to the portion of the Enterprise to be sold, all as shown by a written report of an Independent Certified Public Accountant, plus

(i) An allowance for Net Revenues from any additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise to be made with the proceeds of such sale or with the proceeds of Bonds previously issued, and also for Net Revenues from any such additions, improvements or extensions which have been made from moneys from any source but which, during all or any part of such Fiscal Year or recorded twelve-month period, were not in service, all in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the estimated additional average annual Net Revenues to be derived from such additions, improvements and extensions for the first twenty-four months in which each addition, improvement or extension is respectively to be in operation, all as shown by the certificate or opinion of a Qualified Independent Consultant; and

(ii) An allowance for earnings arising from any increase in the charges made for the use of the Enterprise which has become effective prior to such sale, but which, during all or any part of such Fiscal Year or recorded twelve-month period, was not in effect, in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the amount by which the Net Revenues would have been increased if such increase in charges had been in effect during the whole of such Fiscal Year or recorded twelve-month period, as shown by the certificate or opinion of a Qualified Independent Consultant;

will have produced a sum equal to at least 1.25 times the Maximum Annual Debt Service on the Bonds then Outstanding. Any balance of such proceeds from any such sale not required by the Commission for the purposes aforesaid will be deposited in the Revenue Fund established pursuant to the Indenture and applied as provided in the Indenture.

Operation and Maintenance of Enterprise. The Commission will maintain and preserve the Enterprise in good repair and working order at all times from the Revenues available for such purposes, in conformity with standards customarily followed for municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of like size and character. The Commission will from time to time make all necessary and proper repairs, renewals, replacements and substitutions to the properties of the Enterprise, so that at all times business carried on in connection with the Enterprise will and can be properly and advantageously conducted in an efficient manner and at reasonable cost, and will operate the

Enterprise in an efficient and economical manner, consistent with the protection of the Owners of the Bonds, and will not commit or allow any waste with respect to the Enterprise.

Liens and Claims. Subject to any rights of the United States of America or the State of California, the Commission will keep the Enterprise and all parts thereof free from judgments, from mechanics' and materialmen's liens and from all liens and claims of whatsoever nature or character, to the end that the security provided pursuant to the Indenture may at all times be maintained and preserved, and the Commission will keep the Enterprise and the Revenues free from any liability which might hamper the Commission in conducting its business or operating the Enterprise. Subject to the provisions of the Indenture, the Trustee at its option (after first giving the Commission thirty days' written notice to comply therewith and failure of the Commission to so comply within said thirty-day period) may defend against any and all actions or proceedings in which the validity of the Indenture is or might be questioned, or may pay or compromise any claim or demand asserted in any such actions or proceedings; provided, however, that, in defending against such actions or proceedings or in paying or compromising such claims or demands, the Trustee will not in any event be deemed to have waived or released the Commission from liability for or on account of any of its covenants and warranties contained in the Indenture, or from its liability under the Indenture to defend the validity of the Indenture and the pledge made in the Indenture and to perform such covenants and warranties.

Insurance. The Commission will procure, and maintain at all times while any of the Bonds will be Outstanding, adequate fidelity insurance or bonds on all officers and employees handling or responsible for any Revenues or funds of the Enterprise, such insurance or bonds to be in an aggregate amount at least equal to the maximum amount of such Revenues or funds at any one time in the custody of all such officers and employees or in the amount of one million dollars ($1,000,000), whichever is less.

The insurance described above may be provided as a part of any comprehensive fidelity and other insurance and not separately for the Enterprise.

The Commission may purchase, on all or any of the Bonds of any Series, insurance assuring the Bondowners that the principal of and interest on the insured Bonds will be paid when due and payable. The purchase of any such insurance will not constitute a preference or priority of the insured Bonds over any Bonds not so insured, and all Bonds Outstanding, irrespective of the providing of such insurance on some of the Bonds, will be equally and proportionately secured.

Books and Accounts; Financial Statements. The Commission will keep proper books of record and accounts of the Enterprise, separate from all other records and accounts of the Commission, in which complete and correct entries will be made of all transactions relating to the Enterprise. Such books of record and accounts will at all times during business hours be subject to the inspection of the Trustee or of any Owner of Bonds then Outstanding or their representatives authorized in writing, at reasonable hours and under reasonable conditions.

The Commission further will prepare and file with the Trustee annually, within five months after the close of each Fiscal Year so long as any of the Bonds are Outstanding, financial statements of the Enterprise for the preceding Fiscal Year, prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis from year to year (which financial statements will include a statement showing the balances in each fund required to be established under the provisions of the Indenture), including a balance sheet, statement of income, statement of retained earnings and contributed capital, and statement of changes in financial position, which financial statements will be examined by and include the certificate or opinion of an Independent Certified Public Accountant. Such financial statements will be accompanied by a Certificate of the Commission stating that no Event of Default has occurred or is continuing as of the end of each Fiscal Year, or specifying the nature of the Events of Default, if any, which have occurred and are continuing.

The Commission will furnish a copy of these financial statements to any Bondowner upon request, and will furnish to the Trustee such reasonable number of copies thereof (not exceeding 100 copies) as may be required by the Trustee for distribution to investment bankers, security dealers and others interested in the Bonds and to the Owners of Bonds requesting copies thereof. The Trustee will not be required to incur any nonreimbursable expenses in making such distribution.

The Commission will cause to be published a summary statement showing the amount of Revenues and the amount of all other funds collected which are required to be pledged or otherwise made available as security for payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, the disbursements from such Revenues and other funds in reasonable detail, and a general statement of the financial and physical condition of the Enterprise. The statement will be published annually, not more than 120 days after the close of each Fiscal Year. The Commission will furnish a copy of the statement to any Bondowner upon request.

Upon the effectiveness of the amendments in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture, the provisions of the Indenture described in the second and third paragraph above will be amended and restated in their entirety as described under the caption "FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE – Amendments to Books and Accounts; Financial Statements" below.

Enterprise Budgets. The Commission will prepare and submit to the Mayor for review and submission to the Board of Supervisors for approval an annual budget for the Enterprise for each Fiscal Year. Such budget will set forth in reasonable detail the Revenues anticipated to be derived in such Fiscal Year and the expenditures anticipated to be paid or provided for therefrom in such Fiscal Year including, without limitation, the amounts required to provide for the payment of the principal of and interest and redemption premium, if any, on the Bonds during such Fiscal Year, to pay or provide for Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise for such Fiscal Year, to make up any deficiencies in any fund or account anticipated for the then current Fiscal Year, and to pay or provide for the payment of all other claims or obligations required to be paid from Revenues in such Fiscal Year, and will show that Net Revenues will be at least adequate to satisfy the provisions of the rate covenant under the Indenture. Such budget will comply with any conditions or restrictions set forth in any agreements between the Commission and users of the Enterprise. The Commission will take all action available and necessary to obtain approval or acceptance of the budget by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The Commission will supply to the Trustee and to any Bondowner who will so request in writing a copy of the annual budget for the Fiscal Year covered by such budget. Such budget will be open for inspection by any Owner at the principal corporate trust office of the Trustee during normal business hours. If at any time a revised annual budget for the Enterprise will be adopted which will involve an increase or decrease in the Revenues or in said expenditures of ten percent (10%) or more, the Commission will supply a copy to the Trustee and to any Bondowner who will so requests in writing.

Maintenance of Revenues; Merger with Hetch Hetchy Project. The City will not acquire, construct, operate or maintain, and will not within the scope of its powers permit any other public or private corporation, political subdivision, district or agency or any person whatsoever to acquire, construct, operate or maintain, within the City or any part thereof, any system or utility competitive with the Enterprise. The Commission will have in effect, or cause to have in effect, at all times an ordinance or resolution requiring all customers of the Enterprise to pay the fees, rates and charges applicable to the water, services and facilities furnished by the Enterprise. The Commission will not provide any water service of the Enterprise free of charge to any person, firm or corporation, or to any public agency (including the United States of America, the State of California, and any public corporation, political subdivision, city, county, district or agency of any thereof), except (i) for free use by the City and its agencies, (ii) to the extent that any such free use is required by the terms of any existing contract or agreement and (iii) for incidental insignificant free use so long as such free use does not prevent the Commission from satisfying the other covenants of the Indenture, including, without limitation, the rate covenant under the Indenture.

The Commission will not take any action pursuant to the Charter to accomplish a merger of the Enterprise with the Hetch Hetchy Project, a department of the City under the jurisdiction of the Commission, unless and until the Commission will have provided a method for segregating the Revenues from the revenues of the Hetch Hetchy Project so as to preserve the lien of the Indenture upon the Revenues, and will have obtained an opinion of counsel from a firm nationally recognized in the practice of tax-exempt financing that such merger will not, in and of itself, affect the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Bonds under Section 103 of the Code (if applicable).

Eminent Domain Proceeds. If all or any part of the Enterprise will be taken by or under threat of eminent domain proceedings, the net proceeds realized by the Commission or the City therefrom (excluding any portion thereof payable to the United States of America or the State of California or required by the United States of America or the State of California to be deposited in a restricted fund) will be deposited by the Treasurer in a special fund in trust and applied and disbursed by the Treasurer subject to the following conditions:

(a) If such eminent domain proceedings have had a material adverse effect upon the Revenues and the security of the Bonds, the Commission will by resolution determine to apply such proceeds for one of the following purposes:

(1) The Commission may determine to apply such proceeds to the purchase, defeasance or redemption of Bonds then Outstanding. In that event, the Treasurer will transfer such proceeds to the Trustee who will apply such proceeds on a Proportionate Basis to the redemption, defeasance or purchase of Bonds of each Series then Outstanding in the proportion which the Bond Obligation amount of each Series bears to the aggregate Bond Obligation amount of all Bonds then Outstanding.

(2) The Commission may determine to apply such proceeds to the cost of additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise if (A) the Commission first secures and files with the Trustee a written report of a Qualified Independent Consultant showing (i) the loss in annual Revenues, if any, suffered, or to be suffered, by the Commission by reason of such eminent domain proceedings, (ii) a general description of the additions, improvements or extensions then proposed to be acquired by the Commission from such proceeds, and (iii) an estimate of the additional Revenues to be derived from such additions, improvements or extensions; and (B) such written report states that such additional Revenues will sufficiently offset the loss of Revenues resulting from such eminent domain proceedings so that the ability of the Commission to meet its obligations under the Indenture will not be substantially impaired. The Commission will then promptly proceed with the construction of the additions, improvements or extensions substantially in accordance with such written report. Payments for such construction will be made by the Commission from such proceeds. Any balance of such proceeds not required by the Commission for the purposes aforesaid will be deposited in the Revenue Fund and applied as provided in the Indenture.

(b) If such eminent domain proceedings have had no effect, or at the most a relatively immaterial effect, upon the Revenues and the security of the Bonds, and a Qualified Independent Consultant so concludes in a written report filed with the Trustee, the Commission may determine to apply such proceeds to the costs of additions or improvements to or extensions of the Enterprise or may deposit such proceeds in the Revenue Fund, to be applied as provided in the Indenture.

Tax Covenants. With respect to any Series of Bonds the interest on which is to be excluded from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes, the Commission covenants that it will not take any action, or fail to take any action, if any such action or failure to take action would adversely affect the exclusion from gross income of the interest on such Bonds under Section 103 of the Code. The Commission will not directly or indirectly use or permit the use of any proceeds of any such Bonds or any other funds of the Commission, or take or omit to take any action that would cause such Bonds to be "arbitrage bonds" within the meaning of Section 148(a) of the Code. To that end, the Commission will comply with all requirements of Section 148 of the Code to the extent applicable to a Series of Bonds. If at any time the Commission is of the opinion that for purposes of the provisions of the Indenture summarized under the caption "Tax Covenants" herein it is necessary to restrict or limit the yield on the investment of any moneys held by the Trustee under the Indenture or otherwise, the Commission will so instruct the Trustee in writing, and the Trustee will take such action as required by such instructions.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Commission agrees that there will be paid from time to time all amounts required to be rebated to the United States of America pursuant to Section 148(f) of the Code and any temporary, proposed or final Treasury Regulations as may be applied to a Series of Bonds the interest on which is to be excluded from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes. This covenant will survive payment in full or defeasance of any such Bonds. The Commission specifically covenants to pay or cause to be paid to the United States of America at the times and in the amounts determined under the Indenture the Rebate Requirement. The Trustee agrees to comply with all written instructions of the Commission given in accordance with the applicable Rebate Certificate.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Indenture summarized under this caption, if the Commission provides to the Trustee an opinion of nationally recognized bond counsel to the effect that any action required under the Indenture or under a tax certificate relating to a Series of Bonds is no longer required, or to the effect that some further

action is required, to maintain the exclusion from gross income of the interest on such Series of Bonds under Section 103 of the Code, the Commission and the Trustee may rely conclusively on such opinion in complying with such provisions of the Indenture, and the covenants under the Indenture will be deemed to be modified to that extent.

The Commission will assure that the proceeds of any Series of Bonds the interest on which is to be excluded from gross income of the owners thereof for federal income tax purposes are not so used as to cause such Bonds to satisfy the private business tests of section 141(b) of the Code or the private loan financing test of section 141(c) of the Code. The Commission will not take any action or permit or suffer any action to be taken if the result of the same would be to cause any of such Bonds to be "federally guaranteed" within the meaning of section 149(b) of the Code.

Continuing Disclosure. The Commission covenants and agrees that it will comply with and carry out all of the provisions of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate, dated as of the date of issuance of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds (the "2025 Series DEF Continuing Disclosure Certificate"), executed and delivered by the Commission in connection with the issuance of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds, as it may be supplemented and amended in accordance with its terms. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Indenture, failure of the Commission to comply with the 2025 Series DEF Continuing Disclosure Certificate will not be considered an Event of Default; however, any Participating Underwriter (as such term is defined in the 2025 Series DEF Continuing Disclosure Certificate) or any Bondowner or beneficial owner may take such actions as may be necessary and appropriate, including seeking specific performance by court order, to cause the Commission to comply with is obligations under this Section, and the sole remedy in the event of any failure of the Commission to comply with the 2025 Series DEF Continuing Disclosure Certificate will be an action to compel performance.

EVENTS OF DEFAULT AND REMEDIES OF BONDOWNERS

Events of Default; Acceleration. If one or more of the following events ("Events of Default") shall happen:

(1) if default shall be made in the due and punctual payment of the principal of, or the premium (if any) on, any Bond when and as the same shall become due and payable, whether at maturity as therein expressed, by proceedings for redemption, by declaration or otherwise, or if default shall be made in the redemption from any Sinking Fund Account of any Term Bonds in the amounts and at the times provided therefor;

(2) if default shall be made in the due and punctual payment of any installment of the interest on any Bond when and as such interest installment shall become due and payable;

(3) if default shall be made by the Commission in the observance of any of the other covenants, agreements or conditions on its part in the Indenture or in the Bonds contained, and such default continues for a period of sixty days after written notice of such failure, specifying such default and requiring the same to be remedied, shall have been given to the Commission by the Trustee or by a Credit Provider, or to the Commission and the Trustee by the Owners of not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the Bond Obligation; or

(4) if the Commission or the City shall file a petition or answer seeking reorganization or arrangement under the federal bankruptcy laws or any other applicable law of the United States of America, or if a court of competent jurisdiction shall approve a petition, filed with or without the consent of the Commission or the City, as the case may be, seeking reorganization under the federal bankruptcy laws or any other applicable law of the United States of America, or if, under the provisions of any other law for the relief or aid of debtors, any court of competent jurisdiction shall assume custody or control of the Commission or the City or of the whole or any substantial part of the property of the Commission or the City;

then and in each and every such case during the continuance of such Event of Default, the Trustee may, and upon the written request of the Owners of not less than a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation or of a Credit Provider shall, upon notice in writing to the Commission, declare the principal of all of the Current Interest Bonds then Outstanding, and the interest accrued thereon, the Capital Appreciation Bonds then Outstanding, in the amount of the Accreted Value thereof, and the Parity State Loans then outstanding, in the amount of the obligations

due thereunder, to be due and payable immediately, and upon any such declaration the same shall become and shall be immediately due and payable, anything in the Indenture or in the Bonds contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

This provision, however, is subject to the condition that if, at any time after the principal of the Bonds shall have been so declared due and payable, and before any judgment or decree for the payment of the moneys due shall have been obtained or entered as provided in the Indenture, the Commission shall deposit with the Trustee a sum sufficient to pay all principal and Accreted Value of the Bonds maturing prior to such declaration and all matured installments of interest (if any) upon all the Current Interest Bonds, with interest on such overdue payments of principal and Accreted Value and interest installments at the rate or rates of interest borne by the respective Bonds, and the reasonable expenses of the Trustee, and any and all other defaults known to the Trustee (other than in the payment of principal and Accreted Value of and interest on the Bonds due and payable solely by reason of such declaration) shall have been made good or cured to the satisfaction of the Trustee, or provision deemed by the Trustee to be adequate shall have been made therefor, then, and in every such case, (i) if such declaration shall have been made by the Trustee, the Trustee, or (ii) if such declaration shall have been made upon the written request of Bondowners, the Owners of not less than a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding, or (iii) if such declaration shall have been made upon the written request of a Credit Provider, such Credit Provider, may, by written notice to the Commission and, in cases (ii) and (iii) above, to the Trustee, on behalf of the Owners of all of the Bonds, rescind and annul such declaration and its consequences; but no such rescission and annulment shall extend to or shall affect any subsequent default, or shall impair or exhaust any right or power consequent thereon.

Bondholder Suits. In case one or more of the Events of Default shall happen, then and in every such case the Owner of any Bond at the time Outstanding shall be entitled to proceed to protect and enforce the rights vested in such Owner by the Indenture by such appropriate judicial proceeding as such Owner shall deem most effectual to protect and enforce any such right, either by suit in equity or by action at law, whether for the specific performance of any covenant or agreement contained in the Indenture, or in aid of the exercise of any power granted in the Indenture, or to enforce any other legal or equitable right vested in the Owners of Bonds by the Indenture or by law; provided, however, that no such Bondowner shall have the right to institute any such judicial proceeding pursuant to this Section unless (a) such Owner shall have previously given to the Trustee written notice of the occurrence of an Event of Default under the Indenture; (b) the Owners of at least ten percent (10%) in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding shall have made written request to the Trustee to exercise the powers granted in the Indenture or to institute such action, suit or proceeding in its own name; (c) such Owner or said Owners shall have tendered to the Trustee reasonable indemnity against the costs, expenses and liabilities to be incurred in compliance with such request; (d) the Trustee shall have refused or omitted to comply with such request for a period of sixty (60) days after such written request shall have been received by, and said tender of indemnity shall have been made to, the Trustee; and (e) the Trustee shall not have received contrary directions from the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of Bond Obligation of the Bonds Outstanding. The provisions of the Indenture shall constitute a contract with the Owners of the Bonds, an such contract and duties of the Commission and of the Commission members and of the officers and employees of the Commission and of the City shall be enforceable by any Bondowner by mandamus or other appropriate suit, action or proceeding in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Application of Funds Upon Acceleration. All of the Revenues, including all sums in all of the funds provided for in the Indenture upon the date of declaration of acceleration as provided for in the Section above entitled "Events of Default; Acceleration" and all sums thereafter received by the Commission or the Trustee under the Indenture, shall, if received by the Commission, be transmitted to the Trustee and be applied by the Trustee in the following order, upon presentation of the several Bonds—

First, to the payment of the costs and expenses of the Bondowners in declaring such Event of Default, including reasonable compensation to their agents, attorneys and counsel; and to the payment of the costs and expenses of the Trustee, including but not limited to reasonable compensation to its agents, attorneys and counsel;

Second, to the payment of the whole amount of Bond Obligation then owing and unpaid upon the Bonds, with interest on, with respect to the Current Interest Bonds, the overdue principal and installments of interest, with respect to the Capital Appreciation Bonds, the Accreted Value thereof, and with respect to the Parity State Loans, the obligations due thereunder, at the rate or rates of interest borne by the respective Bonds, and in case such moneys shall be insufficient to pay in full the whole amount so owing and unpaid upon the Bonds, then to the payment of such principal and interest, Accreted Value and obligations (under Parity State Loans) without preference or priority of

principal over interest, or of interest over principal, or of any installment of interest over any other installment of interest, ratably to the aggregate of such principal and interest, Accreted Value and obligations (under Parity State Loans); and

Third, to the payment of all Policy Costs, and in case such moneys shall be insufficient to pay in full all Policy Costs owing and unpaid, then to the payment of such Policy Costs pro rata (calculated by reference to the maximum amounts available under the respective Bond Reserve Fund Policies).

Remedies of Reserve Provider. If the Commission fails to pay Policy Costs to a Reserve Provider to the extent and at the times required by the provisions of the Indenture and such failure continues for 30 days after written notice of such default is received by the Commission and the Trustee from such Reserve Provider or if an Event of Default concerning bankruptcy of the Commission or the City (as described in subsection (4) under the caption "Events of Default; Acceleration" above) shall occur and be continuing, then the Reserve Provider may exercise any remedy provided under the Indenture to the Trustee or available at law or in equity to protect and enforce its right to receive payment of Policy Costs; *provided*, *that*, in no event, will the Reserve Provider be able to declare the principal and Accreted Value of the Bonds and the interest accrued thereon to be due and payable immediately or to exercise any remedy that the Trustee, in its sole discretion, determines would adversely affect the Bondowners.

Rights of Credit Provider. Each Credit Provider, during any period in which an Event of Default has occurred and is continuing, will be recognized as the Owner of each Bond which it guarantees or insures for the purposes of exercising all rights and privileges available to Bondowners. Any acceleration of principal payments with respect to Bonds guaranteed or insured by a Credit Provider are subject to such Credit Provider's prior written consent (but only if such Credit Provider is not in default under its guaranty or insurance policy).

MODIFICATION OR AMENDMENT OF THE INDENTURE

Modification with Consent of Bondowners and Credit Providers. The Indenture may be modified or amended at any time by a Supplemental Indenture which will become binding when the written consents of the Owners of a majority in the aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds (or, if such Supplemental Indenture is only applicable to a Series of Bonds, such Series of Bonds) then Outstanding (exclusive of Bonds owned or held by or for the account of the City or the Commission (but excluding Bonds held in any pension or retirement fund) as provided in the Indenture) and of each Credit Provider (so long as such Credit Provider is not in default under the policy of municipal bond insurance or Letter of Credit issued by it in connection with any Series of Bonds) will have been filed with the Trustee, provided such Credit Provider's consent will not be unreasonably withheld. The Indenture may also be amended or supplemented by a Supplemental Indenture upon written consent of each Credit Provider, provided that at the time of the amendment or supplement the payment of the principal and interest on all Outstanding Bonds is insured by a policy or policies of municipal bond insurance or payable under a Letter of Credit issued by a Credit Provider.

No such modification or amendment may:

(1) extend the fixed maturities of the Bonds, or extend the time for making any Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments, or reduce the rate of interest thereon, or extend the time of payment of interest, or reduce the amount of principal thereof, or reduce any premium payable on the redemption thereof, without the consent of the Owner of each Bond so affected, or

(2) reduce the aforesaid percentage of the Bond Obligation the consent of the Owners of which is required for the execution of any amendment or modification of the Indenture, or

(3) modify any of the rights or obligations of the Trustee without its written consent thereto.

Modification without Consent of Bondowners or Credit Providers. The Indenture and the rights and obligations of the Commission and of the Owners of the Bonds may also be modified or amended at any time by a Supplemental Indenture which will become binding upon adoption, without the consent of any Bondowners or any Credit Provider (but with notice to each Credit Provider), but only to the extent permitted by law and only if the

Trustee determines, which determination may be based upon a good faith reliance upon an Opinion of Counsel, that the provisions of such Supplemental Indenture will not materially adversely affect the interests of the Owners, including, without limitation, for any one or more of the following purposes-

(1) to add to the covenants and agreements of the Commission in the Indenture other covenants and agreements thereafter to be observed or to surrender any right or power reserved to or conferred upon the Commission by the Indenture;

(2) to cure, correct or supplement any ambiguous or defective provision or omission or mistake contained in the Indenture, or in regard to questions arising under the Indenture, as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable;

(3) to provide for the issuance of additional Series of Bonds, and to provide the terms and conditions under which such additional Series of Bonds may be issued, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the Indenture; and

(4) to amend the provisions in the Indenture specifying the purposes, in order of priority, for which expenditures can be made from the Revenue Fund for purposes lower in priority than expenditures on the Bonds.

DEFEASANCE

Discharge of Indenture. If the Commission shall pay and discharge the entire indebtedness on all Bonds Outstanding in any one or more of the following ways-

(a) by well and truly paying or causing to be paid the principal of (including redemption premiums, if any) and interest on all Bonds Outstanding, as and when the same become due and payable (but this clause shall not include Bonds the principal of or interest on which has been paid by a Municipal Bond Insurer until said principal and interest shall have been paid by the Commission); or

(b) by depositing with the Trustee, an escrow agent or other fiduciary, in trust, at or before maturity, money which, together with the amounts then on deposit in the Principal Fund, the Interest Fund and the Bond Reserve Fund, is fully sufficient to pay or redeem all Bonds Outstanding, including all principal, interest and redemption premiums, if any; or

(c) by delivering to the Trustee, for cancellation by it, all Bonds Outstanding; or

(d) by depositing with the Trustee, an escrow agent or other fiduciary, in trust, Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California in such amount which, in the determination of an Independent Certified Public Accountant, who will certify such determination to the Trustee, shall, together with the income or increment to accrue thereon and any other moneys of the Commission made available for such purpose, be fully sufficient to pay and discharge the indebtedness on all Bonds (including all principal, interest and redemption premiums, if any) at or before their respective maturity dates;

and if the Commission shall also pay or causes to be paid all other sums payable under the Indenture by the Commission, including all Policy Costs, then and in that case, at the election of the Commission (evidenced by a Certificate of the Commission signifying its intention to pay and discharge all such indebtedness, which shall be filed with the Trustee), and notwithstanding that any Bonds shall not have been surrendered for payment, the pledge of the Revenues and other funds provided for in the Indenture and all other obligations of the Commission under the Indenture shall cease, terminate and be completely discharged, except only as described below under "Discharge of Liability on Bonds," and the Owners of the Bonds not so surrendered and paid shall thereafter be entitled to payment only out of the money or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California deposited with the Trustee, escrow agent or other fiduciary as aforesaid for their payment, subject, however, to the provisions of the Indenture described below under "Payment of Bonds after Discharge of Indenture." The discharge of the obligations of the Commission

under the Indenture shall be without prejudice to the rights of the Trustee to charge for and be reimbursed by the Commission for any expenditures which it may thereafter incur in connection therewith.

Discharge of Liability on Bonds. Upon the deposit with the Trustee, an escrow agent or other fiduciary, in trust, at or before maturity, of money or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California in the necessary amount to pay or redeem Outstanding Bonds (whether upon or prior to their maturity or the redemption date of such Bonds), provided that if such Bonds are to be redeemed prior to the maturity thereof, notice of such redemption shall have been given as in the Indenture provided or provision satisfactory to the Trustee shall have been made for the giving of such notice, then all liability of the Commission in respect of such Bonds shall cease, determine and be completely discharged, except only that thereafter the Owners thereof shall be entitled to payment of the principal of and interest on such Bonds by the Commission, and the Commission shall remain liable for such payment, but only out of the money or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California deposited in an escrow fund established for this purpose and held by the Trustee, an escrow agent, or other fiduciary, as aforesaid for their payment, subject, however, to the provisions of the Indenture described below under "Payment of Bonds after Discharge of Indenture."

Payment of Bonds after Discharge of Indenture. Notwithstanding any provisions of the Indenture, any moneys deposited in trust for the payment of the principal of, or interest or premium on, any Bonds and remaining unclaimed for two years after the principal of all the Outstanding Bonds has become due and payable (whether at maturity or upon call for redemption or by declaration as provided in the Indenture) shall then be repaid to the Commission upon its Written Request, and the Owners of such Bonds shall thereafter be entitled to look only to the Commission for payment thereof, and all liability of the Trustee or any other fiduciary with respect to such moneys will thereupon cease; provided, however, that before the repayment of such moneys to the Commission, as aforesaid, the Trustee may (at the cost of the Commission) first publish at least once in a Financial Newspaper or Journal a notice, in such form as may be deemed appropriate by the Trustee, with respect to the Bonds so payable and not presented and with respect to the provisions relating to the repayment to the Commission of the moneys held for the payment thereof. In the event of the repayment of any such moneys to the Commission, as aforesaid, the Owners of the Bonds in respect of which such moneys were deposited shall thereafter be deemed to be general creditors of the Commission for amounts equivalent to the respective amounts deposited for the payment of such Bonds and so repaid to the Commission (without interest thereon).

TRUSTEE PROVISIONS

The Trustee will, prior to an Event of Default, and after the curing of all Events of Default which may have occurred, perform such duties and only such duties as are specifically set forth in the Indenture. The Trustee will, during the existence of any Event of Default (which has not been cured), exercise such of the rights and powers vested in it by the Indenture, and use the same degree of care and skill in their exercise, as a prudent man would exercise or use under the circumstances in the conduct of his own affairs.

So long as there is no Event of Default under the Indenture, the Commission may remove the Trustee, by giving written notice to such Trustee and by giving Bondowners notice by mail, first class postage prepaid, of such removal, and any successor thereto, and may appoint a successor or successors thereto; provided that any such successor will be a bank or trust company doing business and having an office in San Francisco, California, having a combined capital and surplus of at least $100,000,000, and subject to supervision or examination by federal or state authority. If such bank or trust company publishes a report of condition at least annually, pursuant to law or to the requirements of any supervising or examining authority above referred to, then for the purpose of this Section the combined capital and surplus of such bank or trust company will be deemed to be its combined capital and surplus as set forth in its most recent report of condition so published.

The Trustee may at any time resign by giving written notice to the Commission and by giving the Bondowners notice by mail, first class postage prepaid, of such resignation. Upon receiving such notice of resignation, the Commission will promptly appoint a successor Trustee by an instrument in writing. Any resignation or removal of the Trustee and appointment of a successor Trustee will become effective upon acceptance of appointment by the successor Trustee. If no successor Trustee is appointed and accepts appointment within 45 days of giving notice of removal or notice of resignation, the resigning Trustee or any Bondowner (on behalf of himself and all other

Bondowners) may petition any court of competent jurisdiction for the appointment of a successor Trustee, and such court may thereupon, after such notice (if any) as it may deem proper, appoint such successor Trustee.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

FORTY-THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDENTURE

The proposed amendments to the Indenture set forth in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture and described below will become effective when the written consents of the Owners of a majority in aggregate amount of the Bond Obligation of the Bonds then Outstanding have been filed with the Trustee and certain other requirements under the Indenture have been satisfied. All Owners of the 2025 Series DEF Bonds and any Bonds issued after the date hereof will be deemed to have agreed to, accepted and consented to the amendments to the Indenture set forth in the Forty-Third Supplemental Indenture for all purposes of the Indenture.

Amendments to Definitions. (i) There shall be added to the Indenture the definition of "Excluded Principal," "Qualified Municipal Advisor" and "SIFMA" having the definitions set forth below; (ii) all references to the term "Parity State Loans" in the Indenture shall be deemed to refer to "Parity Loans" and shall have the definition set forth below; and (iii) the definitions of "Annual Debt Service," "Average Annual Debt Service," "Bondowner," "Owner" and "Maximum Annual Debt Service" in the Indenture shall be replaced by the definitions of such terms set forth below.

Bondowner, Owner

The term "Bondowner" or "Owner" means any person who is the registered owner of any Outstanding Bond, or, if such Outstanding Bond has a maturity of one year or less and is issued in bearer form, means the bearer of such Bond, or, with respect to any Parity Loan, means the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof) or the federal government (or any board, department or agency thereof), as applicable.

Excluded Principal

"Excluded Principal" means each payment of principal of Bonds with a remaining term, on the date of calculation, of not greater than 60 months and which the Commission specifies in a Certificate of the Commission and filed with the Trustee that the Commission intends to pay from the proceeds of Bonds or Parity Loans, other bonds, notes or other obligations of the Commission or moneys other than Revenues. No such determination shall affect the security for the Bonds or Parity Loans or the obligation of the Commission to pay the Bonds and Parity Loans from Revenues.

Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, Average Annual Debt Service

The term "Maximum Annual Debt Service" means, at any point in time, with respect to Bonds then Outstanding, the maximum amount of principal and interest becoming due in the then current or any future Fiscal Year, calculated by the Commission as provided in this definition. For purposes of calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service, the following assumptions are to be used to calculate the principal and interest becoming due in any Fiscal Year:

(i) in determining the principal amount due in each year, payment will (unless a different subsection of this definition applies for purposes of determining principal maturities or amortization) be assumed to be made in accordance with any amortization schedule established for such debt, including any Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments or any scheduled redemption or payment of Bonds on the basis of Accreted Value, and for such purpose, the redemption payment or payment of Accreted Value will be deemed a principal payment and interest that is compounded and paid as Accreted Value will be deemed due on the scheduled redemption or payment date of such Capital Appreciation Bond, but excluding Excluded Principal;

(ii) if any of the Outstanding Series of Bonds constitute Balloon Indebtedness or Balloon Indebtedness and Variable Rate Indebtedness or if Bonds then proposed to be issued would constitute Balloon Indebtedness or Balloon Indebtedness and Variable Rate Indebtedness, then, for purposes of determining Maximum Annual Debt Service, such Bonds the principal of which the Commission has not specified as Excluded Principal will be amortized for a period specified by the Commission (but no longer than forty (40) years from the date of the issuance of the

Bonds to which such Balloon Indebtedness relates) on a substantially level debt service basis or other amortization basis designated by the Commission, calculated based on a fixed rate equal to the rate at which the Commission could borrow for such period, as certified by a Qualified Municipal Advisor;

(iii) if any Outstanding Bonds constitute Tender Indebtedness or if Bonds then proposed to be issued would constitute Tender Indebtedness, then for purposes of determining the amounts of principal and interest due in any Fiscal Year on such Bonds, the options or obligations of the owners of such Bonds to tender the same for purchase or payment prior to their stated maturity or maturities will be treated as a principal maturity occurring on the first date on which owners of such Bonds may or are required to tender such Bonds except that any such option or obligation to tender Bonds will be ignored and not treated as a principal maturity, if (1) such Bonds are rated in one of the two highest long-term rating categories (without reference to gradations such as "plus" or "minus") by Moody's and by S&P or such Bonds are rated in the highest short-term, note or commercial paper rating categories by Moody's and by S&P and (2) the obligation, if any, the Commission may have under a Letter of Credit Agreement with respect to such Bonds, other than its obligations on such Bonds, will either be subordinated to the obligation of the Commission on the Bonds or be incurred under the conditions and meeting the tests for the issuance of Additional Bonds set forth in the Indenture;

(iv) if any Outstanding Bonds constitute Variable Rate Indebtedness, the interest rate shall, as of the date of calculation, be: (i) the greater of (a) the average SIFMA rate over the past 3 years times 150% or (b) 4 percent or (ii) if, designated in writing by the Commission in the Supplemental Indenture authorizing such Bonds (which the Commission must certify, in the case of obligations interest on which is not excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes under the Code), a fixed rate of interest reasonably determined by the Commission for obligations with similar duration, which interest rate has been certified by a Qualified Municipal Advisor as reasonable concurrent with the execution and delivery of such Supplemental Indenture;

(v) if Bonds proposed to be issued will be Variable Rate Indebtedness, then such Bonds will be assumed to bear interest at: (i) the greater of (a) the average SIFMA rate over the past 3 years times 150% or (b) 4 percent or (ii) if, designated in writing by the Commission in the Supplemental Indenture authorizing such Bonds (which the Commission must certify, in the case of obligations interest on which is not excluded from gross income for federal income tax purposes under the Code), a fixed rate of interest reasonably determined by the Commission for obligations with similar duration, which interest rate has been certified by a Qualified Municipal Advisor as reasonable concurrent with the execution and delivery of such Supplemental Indenture;

(vi) if moneys or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California have been deposited with and are held by the Trustee or another fiduciary to be used to pay principal and/or interest on specified Bonds, then the principal and/or interest to be paid from such moneys or Federal Securities or general obligation bonds of the State of California or from the earnings thereon will be disregarded and not included in calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service.

The term "Annual Debt Service" means the sum of such principal and interest as computed for the twelve-month period ending June 30 to which reference is made.

The term "Debt Service" means the sum of all such principal and interest.

The term "Average Annual Debt Service" means total Debt Service, divided by the number of twelve-month periods ending on June 30 (including any fractional periods) remaining until the last maturity date of any Outstanding Bond.

For the purpose of calculating Maximum Annual Debt Service, Annual Debt Service, Debt Service, and Average Annual Debt Service, in determining the amount of interest coming due during any twelve-month period ending June 30 on any Series of Bonds that were issued as Build America Bonds, such amount will be reduced by an amount equal to the Refundable Credits the Commission is scheduled to receive during each such twelve-month period ending June 30. If the amount of Refundable Credits scheduled to be received by the Commission for any Series of Bonds that were issued as Build America Bonds is reduced or otherwise not received during any twelve-month period ending June 30, the Commission will calculate the amount of interest due on such Series of Bonds for the subsequent twelve month period ending June 30 by offsetting against the gross amount of interest payable on such Series only the

amount of the Refundable Credits scheduled to be received under Federal legislation (or other Federal regulation, pronouncement or action) authorizing the reduction of Refundable Credits.

Parity Loans

"Parity Loans" means those loan agreements entered into between the Commission and the State of California (or any board, department or agency thereof) or the federal government (or any board, department or agency thereof) to finance additions, betterments, extensions, repairs, renewals or replacements to the Enterprise, which are entered into after the issuance of the Bonds and which, by their terms, are secured by a pledge and lien on Revenues on a parity basis with debt service on the Bonds. Parity Loans may be evidenced by or secured by Bonds.

Qualified Municipal Advisor

"Qualified Municipal Advisor" means a person or a firm selected by the Commission who or which engages in the business of advising the management of public agencies similar to the Commission concerning the issuance of debt.

SIFMA

"SIFMA" means, as of any date, the most recent rate determined on the basis of the seven-day high grade market index of tax-exempt variable rate demand obligations, as calculated and published by Bloomberg and made available by the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association on its SIFMA Municipal Swap Index, or if the SIFMA Municipal Swap Index is no longer published or reported, the rate per annum published or reported on the S&P Municipal Bond 7 Day High Grade Rate Index, or if neither the SIFMA Municipal Swap Index nor the S&P Municipal Bond 7 Day High Grade Rate Index is published, a per annum rate equal to 60% of the yield of the three-month U.S. Treasury bill as reported as of the end of each trading day.

Amendments to Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding. The provision of the Indenture described in paragraph (c) under the caption "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS – Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding" in this Appendix will be amended and restated in its entirety to provide as follows:

(c) Fixed serial maturities or mandatory Minimum Sinking Fund Account Payments, or any combination thereof, shall be established in amounts sufficient to provide for the retirement of all of the Bonds of such additional Series on or before their respective maturity dates; provided, however, that such requirement shall not apply to Balloon Indebtedness or principal amounts of such Series of Bonds which the Commission has specified as Excluded Principal.

The provision of the Indenture described in paragraph (e) under the caption "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS – Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds for Refunding" in this Appendix will be amended and restated in its entirety to provide as follows:

(e) After giving effect to the application of the proceeds of the additional Series of Bonds, either (i) Annual Debt Service will not be increased in any Fiscal Year (excluding Debt Service on the Outstanding Bonds to be refunded) in an amount in excess of 5% or (ii) the Average Annual Debt Service for the Bonds of such additional Series (during the period from their issuance to their last maturity date) shall be equal to or less than the Average Annual Debt Service on the Bonds to be refunded (during the period from the issuance of the additional Series to the last maturity date of the Bonds to be refunded).

Amendments to Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds. The provision of the Indenture described in paragraph (c)(1) under the caption "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS – Proceedings for the Issuance of Additional Series of Bonds" in this Appendix will be amended and restated in its entirety to provide as follows:

(1) If the additional Series of Bonds are being issued pursuant to Section 3.04, after the sale of the Series of Additional Bonds proposed to be issued (but prior to the issuance and delivery thereof and receipt of payment therefor),

the Commission shall file the following documents with the Trustee; these documents shall, with respect to such Series of Additional Bonds, be based upon the actual interest rate or rates determined at the time of sale thereof (except that, with respect to Variable Rate Indebtedness, the interest rate for the Series of Additional Bonds shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (iv) of the definition of Maximum Annual Debt Service).

(i) A Certificate of the Commission setting forth for each of the next three Fiscal Years estimates of (A) Revenues, (B) Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise and (3) Net Revenues.

(ii) A Certificate of the Commission demonstrating that (1) the ratio of (A) Net Revenues for the most recent Fiscal Year for which audited financial statements are available, or any consecutive twelve calendar month period during the eighteen calendar month period prior to the issuance of such additional Series of Bonds, to (B) Annual Debt Service for the current Fiscal Year, calculated as of the date of sale of, and including such additional Series of Bonds, will not be less than 1.25:1; or (2) the ratio of (A) Net Revenues projected by the Commission for each of the next three Fiscal Years as determined in clause (i) above, and including in such projections amounts projected to be received from any adopted rate increases (but excluding the Bond Reserve Fund), to (B) Annual Debt Service in each of such three Fiscal Years, calculated as of the date of sale of and including such additional Series of Bonds, will not be less than 1.25:1 in each of such Fiscal Years.

Amendments to Consent Required for Other Issuances of Additional Bonds. The provision of the Indenture described in the final paragraph under the caption "BOND PROCEEDS FUNDS; ADDITIONAL SERIES OF BONDS – Consent Required for Other Issuances of Additional Bonds" in this Appendix will be amended and restated in its entirety to provide as follows:

In addition, the Commission may enter into Parity Loans if no Event of Default has occurred and is continuing under this Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture (and no event has occurred which, but for the passage of time or the giving of notice, would constitute an Event of Default under this Indenture or any Supplemental Indenture) and, on the date of the execution and delivery of such Parity Loans and with respect to Parity Loans executed and delivered prior to the effective date of the amendments set forth in Article CLXXXVII, on the effective date of the amendments set forth in Article CLXXXVII, the Commission delivers a Certificate to the Trustee setting forth, for each of the next three Fiscal Years after the delivery of the Parity Loans, and in the case of Parity Loans executed and delivered prior to the effective date of the amendments set forth in Article CLXXXVII, the next three Fiscal Years, determined on such date, (i) the Revenues, Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise and Net Revenues and (ii) the Annual Debt Service (assuming the delivery of the Parity Loans), and demonstrating that the estimated Net Revenues (together with any fund balances of the Commission, which are available for Debt Service, but excluding the Bond Reserve Fund), in each of such Fiscal Years is at least equal to 1.25 times the Annual Debt Service in each of such Fiscal Years.

Amendments to Books and Accounts; Financial Statements. The provisions of the Indenture described in the second and third paragraphs under the caption "SELECTED COVENANTS OF THE COMMISSION – Books and Accounts; Financial Statements" in this Appendix will be amended and restated in their entirety to provide as follows:

The Commission will prepare and file with the Trustee annually, within seven months after the close of each Fiscal Year so long as any of the Bonds are Outstanding, financial statements of the Enterprise for the preceding Fiscal Year, prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis from year to year (which financial statements will include a statement showing the balances in each fund required to be established under the provisions of the Indenture), including a balance sheet, statement of income, statement of retained earnings and contributed capital, and statement of changes in financial position, which financial statements will be examined by and include the certificate or opinion of an Independent Certified Public Accountant. Such financial statements will be accompanied by a Certificate of the Commission stating that no Event of Default has occurred or is continuing as of the end of each Fiscal Year, or specifying the nature of the Events of Default, if any, which have occurred and are continuing.

Amendments to Covenant Regarding Amounts of Rates and Charges. The Commission's rate covenant set forth in the Indenture as described in the Official Statement under the caption "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS –

Rate Covenants – Sufficiency of Revenue" and the first paragraph under "SECURITY FOR THE BONDS – Rate Covenants – Debt Service Coverage" will be amended and the amended provisions will provide as follows:

To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Commission shall establish, fix and prescribe, prior to the commencement of each Fiscal Year, rates, fees and charges in connection with the water, services and facilities furnished by the Enterprise so as to yield Revenues at least sufficient, after making reasonable allowances for contingencies and error in the estimates to pay the following amounts:

(1) the interest on and principal of the Bonds as they become due and payable (but not including any interest moneys for the payment of which have been deposited in the Interest Fund from the proceeds of any Series of Bonds or from any other source);

(2) all other payments required for compliance with the terms of the Indenture and of any Supplemental Indenture providing for the issuance of Additional Series of Bonds pursuant to the Indenture;

(3) all other payments to meet any other obligations of the SFPUC which are charges, liens or encumbrances upon, or payable from, the Revenues; and

(4) all current Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise (but not including such Operation and Maintenance Costs of the Enterprise as are scheduled to be paid by the SFPUC from moneys other than Revenues, such money to be clearly available for such purpose).

In addition to the requirements described in the paragraph above, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the Commission shall establish, fix and prescribe, prior to the commencement of each Fiscal Year, rates, fees and charges in connection with the water, services and facilities furnished by the Enterprise, which are reasonably expected to be at least sufficient to yield during such Fiscal Year Net Revenues (together with any fund balances of the Commission, which are available for Debt Service, but excluding the Bond Reserve Fund) equal to 1.25 times Annual Debt Service payable in such Fiscal Year.

So long as the Commission has complied with its obligations described in two paragraphs above under this caption "Amendments to Covenant Regarding Amounts of Rates and Charges," the failure to yield the amount of Revenues as described in such first paragraph, or the failure of Net Revenues to equal 1.25 times Annual Debt Service as described in such second paragraph at the end of a Fiscal Year, shall not constitute a default or an Event of Default under the Indenture so long as the Commission has complied with such first and second paragraphs at the commencement of the succeeding Fiscal Year.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT

The following brief summary of certain provisions of the Water Supply Agreement is subject in all respects to all of the provisions of such document. This brief summary does not purport to be a complete statement of said provisions and prospective purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds are referred to the complete text of said document.

This brief summary does not reflect the amendments to the Water Supply Agreement approved by the Commission on May 13, 2025, for the purpose of adjusting the Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities for four Wholesale Customers. The SFPUC anticipates that all of the Wholesale Customers will approve such amendment within the next six months. For a brief description of those amendments, see "THE WATER ENTERPRISE – Wholesale Deliveries – Minimum Annual Purchases" in the front part of this Official Statement.

Definitions

"**1984 Agreement**" refers to the 1984 Settlement Agreement and Master Water Sales Contract between the City and County of San Francisco and certain Suburban Purchasers in San Mateo County, Santa Clara County and Alameda County, which expired on June 30, 2009.

"**Act**" refers to the Raker Act, 38 Stat. 242, the Act of Congress, enacted in 1913, that authorized the construction of the Hetch Hetchy system on federal lands.

"**Adjusted Proportional Annual Use**" means the respective percentages of annual water use, as adjusted to reflect deliveries of water by the Hetch Hetchy Water & Power Project to outside City Retail Customers.

"**Agreement**" refers to the Water Supply Agreement, by and among San Francisco and the Wholesale Customers who approve the Agreement.

"**BAWSCA**" refers to the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency established pursuant to Division 31 of the California Water Code (Water Code §§81300-81461) or its successor and permitted assigns.

"**CEQA**" refers to the California Environmental Quality Act found at §§21000 et seq. of the Public Resources Code and the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act found at §§15000 et seq. of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, as amended from time to time.

"**Commission**" means the governing board of the SFPUC.

"**Debt Service**" means principal and interest paid during a fiscal year on Indebtedness incurred by the SFPUC the proceeds of which are used or are scheduled to be used for the acquisition or construction of New Regional Assets or to refund such Indebtedness.

"**Direct Retail**" refers to Regional Water System capital or operating expenditures that are incurred to provide water service solely to Retail Customers.

"**Direct Wholesale**" refers to Regional Water System capital or operating expenditures that are incurred to provide water service solely to one or more Wholesale Customers.

"**Drought**" means a water shortage caused by lack of precipitation, as reflected in resolutions of the Commission calling for voluntary or mandatory water rationing based on evaluation of water stored or otherwise available to the Regional Water System, whether or not the Commission declares a water shortage emergency pursuant to Water Code §§ 350 et seq., as amended from time to time.

"**Emergency**" means a sudden, non-drought event, such as an earthquake, failure of Regional Water System infrastructure or other catastrophic event or natural disaster that results in an insufficient supply of water available to the Retail or Wholesale Service Areas for basic human consumption, firefighting, sanitation, and fire protection.

"**Encumbrance**" or "**Encumber**" refers to the process by which the City Controller certifies the availability of amounts previously appropriated by the Commission for specifically identified SFPUC capital projects performed either by third parties or through work orders to other San Francisco departments.

"**Environmental Enhancement Surcharge**" means the surcharge to be imposed by the SFPUC on individual parties to the Agreement whose use exceeds their Interim Supply Allocation when the collective use of water by all parties to the Agreement is in excess of the Interim Supply Limitation.

"**Excess Use Charges**" are monthly charges set by the SFPUC, in the form of multipliers, that are applied to the Wholesale Customer water rates during times of mandatory rationing if a Wholesale Customer's water usage is greater than its shortage allocation.

"**Fundamental Rights**" of Wholesale Customers are their status as parties to the Agreement, their allocation of water recognized in the Agreement, their protection against arbitrary, unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory rates and any other specific rights described in the Agreement.

"**Hetch Hetchy Enterprise**" refers to Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Enterprise, a SFPUC operating department.

"**Indebtedness**" includes revenue bonds, bond anticipation notes, certificates of participation (excluding certificates of participation towards which SFPUC contributes debt service as an operating expense), and commercial paper.

"**Individual Supply Guarantee**" refers to each Wholesale Customer's share of the Supply Assurance.

"**Individual Water Sales Contract**" refers to the contracts between each Wholesale Customer and San Francisco that details customer-specific matters such as location of service connections, service area maps and other matters specific to that customer.

"**Interim Supply Allocation**" refers to each Wholesale Customer's share, to be established by the SFPUC of the Interim Supply Limitation.

"**Interim Supply Limitation**" refers to the 265 MGD annual average limitation on water deliveries from Regional Water System watersheds.

"**Joint**," when used in connection with Hetch Hetchy Enterprise assets or expenses, refers to assets used or expenses incurred in providing both water supply ("Water-Related") and in the generation and transmission of electrical energy ("Power-Related").

"**Local System Water**" refers to Regional Water System water supplies developed in San Mateo, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties or otherwise not produced by the Hetch Hetchy Enterprise under rights of way granted by the Act.

"**MGD**" refers to an average flow rate of one million gallons per day over a specific time period, often a year. For example, one MGD is equal to 365 million gallons per year or 1,120 acre feet per year.

"**Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity**" means the minimum amount of water that a Wholesale Customer that has as Individual Supply Guarantee agrees to purchase from San Francisco annually.

"**Net Annual Debt Service**" refers to debt service less payments made from proceeds of Indebtedness (e.g., capitalized interest), earnings on bond proceeds (e.g., reserve fund earnings) used to pay Debt Service, and interest paid from renewed commercial paper, or from reserve fund liquidation.

"**New Assets**" refers to Regional and Hetch Hetchy Water-Only and Water-Related capital assets added to Regional Water System plant in service after June 30, 2009.

"**New Regional Assets**" refers to New Assets placed in service on or after July 1, 2009 that are used and useful in delivering water to Wholesale Customers. The following four categories comprise New Regional Assets:

1. Water Enterprise Regional Assets

2. Water Enterprise Direct Wholesale Assets

3. Hetch Hetchy Water Only Assets

4. Water-Related portion (45 percent) of Hetch Hetchy Joint Assets

"**Power-Only**," when used with reference to Hetch Hetchy Enterprise capital costs and operating and maintenance expenses, means capital costs and expenses that are incurred solely for the construction and operation of assets used to generate and transmit electrical energy.

"**Power-Related**" refers to the power related portion (55%) of Joint Hetch Hetchy Enterprise assets or expenses.

"**Proportional Annual Use**" means the shares of deliveries from the Regional Water System used by City Retail Customers and by the Wholesale Customers in a fiscal year, expressed as a percentage.

"**Proportional Water Use**" refers the general principle of allocating Regional Water System costs based on the relative purchases of water by Retail and Wholesale Customers.

"**Regional Water System**" means the water storage, transmission and treatment system operated by the SFPUC in Tuolumne, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco counties, including projects constructed under the WSIP, but excluding Direct Retail and Direct Wholesale assets.

"**Regional**," when used with reference to Water Enterprise capital assets and operating expenses, refers to assets and expenses that benefit Wholesale and Regional Customers.

"**Retail Customers**" means any customer that purchases water from San Francisco that is not a Wholesale Customer, whether located inside or outside of San Francisco.

"**Retail Service Area**" means the areas where SFPUC sells water to Retail Customers.

"**Retail Water**" means water sold by the SFPUC to its Retail Customers within and outside San Francisco.

"**San Francisco**" refers to the City and County of San Francisco.

"**SFPUC**" refers to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission as an operating department of San Francisco, the General Manager of which reports to the Commission.

"**Substantially Expended,**" when used with respect to a specific bond issue, means 98% of the proceeds from that bond issue and investment earnings contributed to the project fund have been expended.

"**Supply Assurance**" means the 184 MGD maximum annual average metered supply of water dedicated by San Francisco to public use in the Wholesale Service Area (not including San José and Santa Clara).

"**Temporary Modified Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity**" means the minimum amount of water that a Wholesale Customer that has an Individual Supply Guarantee, which has received a permanent transfer of a portion of Individual Supply Guarantee and a portion of Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity, agrees to purchase from San Francisco on a temporary annual basis.

"**Term**" means the 25-year term of the Agreement commencing July 1, 2009, including one or both 5-year extensions authorized by the Agreement.

"**Tier 1 Shortage Plan**" refers to the Water Shortage Allocation Plan, adopted by the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers in conjunction with the Agreement describing the method for allocating water between the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers collectively for shortages of up to 20% of deliveries from the Regional Water System, as amended from time-to-time.

"**Water Enterprise**" refers to the San Francisco Water Department (SFWD), an SFPUC Operating Department.

"**Water Management Charge**" refers to the charge collected by San Francisco on behalf of BAWSCA for local water resource development in the Wholesale Service Area.

"**Water-Only**," when used with reference to Hetch Hetchy Enterprise capital costs and operating and maintenance expenses, means capital costs and expenses that are incurred solely for the construction and operation of assets used to protect water quality or to provide for the delivery of water for consumptive purposes.

"**Water-Related**" refers to the water related portion (45%) of Joint Hetch Hetchy Enterprise assets or expenses.

"**Wheeling Statute**" refers to Article 4 of Chapter 11 of the California Water Code, as amended from time to time.

"**Wholesale Capital Fund**" is the account established by the SFPUC for deposit of Wholesale Customer revenue that is used to fund the wholesale share of revenue-funded New Regional Assets.

"**Wholesale Customer**" or "**Customers**" means one or more of the 26 water customers that are contracting for purchase of water from San Francisco pursuant to the Agreement. Cordilleras Mutual Water Company is a wholesale customer of the SFPUC, but is not a party to Water Supply Agreement and is not a "Wholesale Customer."

"**Wholesale Revenue Coverage**" refers to the additional dollar amount included in wholesale rates each fiscal year that is charged to Wholesale Customers by the SFPUC for their proportionate share of Debt Service coverage.

"**Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve**" refers to the account established by the SFPUC for deposit of Wholesale Revenue Coverage.

"**Wholesale Revenue Requirement**" means the calculated Wholesale Customer portion of SFPUC Regional Water System capital and operating costs.

"**Wholesale Service Area**" means the combined service areas of the Wholesale Customers, as delineated on the service area maps attached to each Individual Water Sales Contract.

"**WSIP**" refers to the Water System Improvement Program approved by the Commission in Resolution No. 08-0200 on October 30, 2008, as amended from time to time.

Term

The Term of the Agreement is twenty-five (25) years. The Term began on July 1, 2009 and ends on June 30, 2034.

In December 2031, the SFPUC may provide written notice to the Wholesale Customers that it is willing to extend the Term of the Agreement. Between January 1, 2032 and June 30, 2032, any Wholesale Customer may accept the SFPUC's offer to extend the Term by providing a written notice of extension to the SFPUC. If such notices of extension are received from Wholesale Customers representing at least two-thirds in number as of June 30, 2032 and seventy five percent (75%) of the quantity of water delivered by the SFPUC to all Wholesale Customers during fiscal year 2030-31, the Term shall be extended for another five (5) years ("First Extension Term"), through June 30, 2039. No party to the Agreement which does not wish to remain a party during the Extension Term shall be compelled to do so by the actions of other parties.

In December 2036, the SFPUC may provide written notice to the Wholesale Customers that it is willing to extend the Term of the Agreement. Between January 1, 2037 and June 30, 2037, any Wholesale Customer may accept the SFPUC's offer to extend the Term by providing a written notice of extension to the SFPUC. If such notices of extension are received from Wholesale Customers representing at least two-thirds in number as of June 30, 2037 and seventy five percent (75%) of the quantity of water delivered by the SFPUC to all Wholesale Customers during fiscal year 2035-36, the Term shall be extended for another five (5) years ("Second Extension Term"), through June 30, 2044. No party to the Agreement which does not wish to remain a party during the Extension Term shall be compelled to do so by the actions of other parties.

Amendments to Agreement

The Agreement may be amended with the written consent of San Francisco and of Wholesale Customers representing at least two-thirds in number and seventy five percent (75%) of the quantity of water delivered by San Francisco to all Wholesale Customers during the fiscal year immediately preceding the amendment.

No amendment which adversely affects a Fundamental Right of a Wholesale Customer may be made without the written consent of that customer.

Supply Assurance

San Francisco agrees to deliver water to the Wholesale Customers up to the amount of the Supply Assurance. Water delivered by San Francisco to Retail Customers shall not be included in the Supply Assurance. Such commitment is subject to the Interim Supply Limitation provisions in the Agreement.

Both the Supply Assurance and the Individual Supply Guarantees identified are expressed in terms of daily deliveries on an annual average basis and do not themselves constitute a guarantee by San Francisco to meet peak daily or hourly demands of the Wholesale Customers, irrespective of what those peak demands may be. The parties acknowledge, however, that the Regional Water System has been designed and constructed to meet peak daily and hourly demands and that its capacity to do so has not yet been reached. San Francisco agrees to operate the Regional Water System to meet peak requirements of the Wholesale Customers to the extent possible without adversely affecting its ability to meet peak demands of Retail Customers. The Agreement shall not preclude San Francisco from undertaking to meet specific peak demand requirements of individual Wholesale Customers in their Individual Water Sales Contracts.

The Supply Assurance is perpetual and shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of the Agreement. Similarly, the Individual Supply Guarantees and/or the Individual Water Sales Contracts are perpetual and shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of the Agreement or the Individual Water Sales Contracts.

The amount of water made available by San Francisco to the Wholesale Customers is subject to reduction, to the extent and for the period made necessary by reason of water shortage, Drought, Emergencies, or by malfunctioning or rehabilitation of facilities in the Regional Water System. The amount of water made available to

the Wholesale Customers may not be reduced, however, merely because the water recycling and groundwater projects which WSIP envisions to be constructed within San Francisco, or the conservation programs intended to reduce water use by Retail Customers that are included in the WSIP, do not generate the yield or savings (10 MGD combined) anticipated by San Francisco.

Allocation of Supply Assurance

A portion of the Supply Assurance has been allocated among 24 of the 26 Wholesale Customers. Three Wholesale Customers do not have Individual Supply Guarantees. The cities of San José and Santa Clara do not have an Individual Supply Guarantee because San Francisco has provided water to them on a temporary and interruptible basis. The City of Hayward does not have an Individual Supply Guarantee because of the terms of the 1962 contract between it and San Francisco.

If the total amount of water delivered by San Francisco to Hayward and to the Wholesale Customers with Individual Supply Guarantees exceeds 184 MGD over a period of three consecutive fiscal years (i.e., July 1 through June 30), then the Individual Supply Guarantees of those Wholesale Customers shall be reduced pro rata so that their combined entitlement and the sustained use by Hayward does not exceed 184 MGD.

It is the responsibility of each Wholesale Customer to limit its purchases of water from San Francisco so as to remain within its Individual Supply Guarantee. San Francisco is not liable to any Wholesale Customer or obligated to supply more water to any Wholesale Customer individually or to the Wholesale Customers collectively than the amount to which it or they are otherwise entitled under the Agreement due to the use by any Wholesale Customer of more water than the amount to which it is entitled under the Agreement.

San Francisco installs such new connections between the Regional Water System and the distribution system of any Wholesale Customer that are necessary to deliver the quantities of water to which the Wholesale Customer is entitled under the Agreement. San Francisco has the right to determine the location of such connections, in light of the need to maintain the structural integrity of the Regional Water System and, where applicable, the need to limit peaking directly off of Regional Water System pipelines by a Wholesale Customer's individual retail customers, the need to ensure that a Wholesale Customer's individual retail customers have access to alternative sources of water in the event of a reduction in San Francisco's ability to provide them with water, and other factors which may affect the desirability or undesirability of a particular location.

Wholesale Customer Service Areas

A Wholesale Customer may not deliver water furnished to it by San Francisco outside the boundary of its service area without the prior written consent of San Francisco, except for deliveries to another Wholesale Customer on an emergency and temporary basis. San Francisco may refuse a Wholesale Customer's request to expand its service area on any reasonable basis.

If two or more Wholesale Customers agree to adjust the boundaries of their respective service areas so that one assumes an obligation to serve customers in an area that was previously within the service area of another Wholesale Customer, they may also correspondingly adjust their respective Individual Supply Guarantees. Such adjustments require only the consent of San Francisco and the Wholesale Customers involved, so long as the Supply Assurance and the Individual Supply Guarantees of other Wholesale Customers are not affected.

San Francisco acknowledges that it has heretofore consented in writing to deliveries of water by individual Wholesale Customers outside their service area boundaries and agrees that nothing in the Agreement is intended to affect such prior authorizations, which remain in full force and effect according to their terms.

Permanent Transfers of Individual Supply Guarantees and Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities

A Wholesale Customer that has an Individual Supply Guarantee may transfer a portion of it to one or more other Wholesale Customers; transfers of a portion of an Individual Supply Guarantee must be permanent; and transfers of portions of Individual Supply Guarantees are subject to approval by the SFPUC. SFPUC review is limited to

(1) whether a proposed transfer complies with the Act, and (2) whether the affected facilities in the Regional Water System have sufficient capacity to accommodate delivery of the increased amount of water to the proposed transferee.

Transfers of a portion of a Minimum Annual Purchase Quantity may be included in transfers of a portion of an Individual Supply Guarantee and are subject to the same requirements for Individual Supply Guarantee transfers as well as certain additional conditions.

Restrictions on Resale

Each Wholesale Customer agrees that it will not sell any water purchased from San Francisco to a private party for resale by such private party to others in violation of the Act.

Each Wholesale Customer also agrees that it will not sell water purchased from San Francisco to another Wholesale Customer without prior written approval of the SFPUC, except on a temporary and emergency basis. The SFPUC agrees that it will not unreasonably withhold its consent to a request by a Wholesale Customer to deliver water to another Wholesale Customer for resale.

Conservation; Use of Local Sources

Each Wholesale Customer shall take all actions within its legal authority related to water conservation that are necessary to insure that the SFPUC (a) remains eligible for (i) state and federal grants and (ii) access to the Drought Water Bank operated by the California Department of Water Resources, as well as other Drought-related water purchase or transfer programs, and (b) complies with future legal requirements imposed on the Regional Water System by the federal government, the State, or any other third party as conditions for receiving funding or water supply.

San Francisco and each Wholesale Customer agree that they will diligently apply their best efforts to use both surface water and groundwater sources located within their respective service areas and available recycled water to the maximum feasible extent, taking into account the environmental impacts, the public health effects and the effects on supply reliability of such use, as well as the cost of developing such sources.

Restrictions on Purchases of Water from Others; Minimum Annual Purchases

Each Wholesale Customer (except for Alameda County Water District and the cities of Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale) agrees that it will not contract for, purchase or receive, with or without compensation, directly or indirectly, from any person, corporation, governmental agency or other entity, any water for delivery or use within its service area without the prior written consent of San Francisco.

The prohibition in the preceding sentence does not apply to:

1. recycled water;

2. water necessary on an emergency and temporary basis, provided that the Wholesale Customer promptly gives San Francisco notice of the nature of the emergency, the amount of water that has been or is to be purchased, and the expected duration of the emergency; or

3. water in excess of a Wholesale Customer's Individual Supply Guarantee.

Alameda County Water District and the cities of Milpitas, Mountain View and Sunnyvale may purchase water from sources other than San Francisco, provided that San Francisco shall require that each purchase a minimum annual quantity of water from San Francisco. These Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities are set out in the Agreement and the Individual Water Sales Contracts between San Francisco and each of these four Wholesale Customers, and a portion of such a quantity may be transferred to another Wholesale Customer at the same time as a transfer of a portion of Individual Supply Guarantee. Certain Wholesale Customers may also be required to purchase Temporary Modified Minimum Annual Purchase Quantities from San Francisco.

Water Quality

San Francisco shall deliver treated water to Wholesale Customers (except Coastside County Water District, which receives untreated water from Crystal Springs and Pilarcitos Reservoirs) that complies with primary maximum contaminant level and treatment technique standards at the regulatory entry points designated in the San Francisco Regional Water System Domestic Water Supply Permit (currently Permit No. 02-04-04P3810001) issued by the California Department of Public Health.

Regional Water System Repair, Maintenance and Operation

San Francisco will keep the Regional Water System in good working order and repair consistent with prudent utility practice.

San Francisco will continue to operate its reservoirs in a manner that assigns higher priority to the delivery of water to the Bay Area and the environment than to the generation of electric power. The SFPUC, as the Regional Water System operator, is solely responsible for making day-to-day operational decisions.

Shortages

Notwithstanding San Francisco's obligations to deliver the Supply Assurance to the Wholesale Customers collectively and the Individual Supply Guarantees to Wholesale Customers individually, San Francisco may reduce the amount of water available or interrupt water deliveries to specific geographical areas within the Regional Water System service area to the extent that such reductions are necessary due to Emergencies, or in order to install, repair, rehabilitate, replace, investigate or inspect equipment in, or perform other maintenance work on, the Regional Water System. Such reductions or interruptions may be imposed by San Francisco without corresponding reductions or interruptions in the amount of water available to SFPUC water users outside the specific geographical area where reductions or interruptions are necessary, if the system's ability to supply water outside the specific geographical area has not been impaired. In the event of such a reduction or interruption, San Francisco will restore the supply of water to the specific geographical area as soon as is possible.

Following a major system emergency event, the SFPUC will work closely with its Wholesale Customers to monitor customer demand, including the demand source. In the event that any individual Wholesale Service Area or Retail Service Area customer's uncontrolled distribution system leaks could result in major water waste and endanger the supply provided by the Regional Water System as a whole, flow through some customer connections may need to be temporarily reduced or terminated. SFPUC will work closely with customers to assess the nature of the demand (e.g., fire-fighting versus leakage), so that public health and safety protection can be given top priority.

1. All emergencies that require use of non-potable source water will require use of chlorine, or other suitable disinfectant, if feasible.

2. San Francisco will use its best efforts to meet the seismic reliability and delivery reliability level of service goals adopted by the Commission in conjunction with the WSIP. San Francisco will distribute water on an equitable basis throughout the Regional Water System service area following a regional Emergency, subject to physical limitations caused by damage to the Regional Water System.

Notwithstanding San Francisco's obligations to deliver the Supply Assurance to the Wholesale Customers collectively and the Individual Supply Guarantees to Wholesale Customers individually, San Francisco may reduce the amount of water available to the Wholesale Customers in response to Drought.

1. The Tier 1 Shortage Plan set forth in the Agreement will continue to be used to allocate water from the Regional Water System between Retail and Wholesale Customers during system-wide shortages of 20% or less.

2. San Francisco and the Wholesale Customers may negotiate in good faith revisions to the Tier 1 Shortage Plan to adjust for and accommodate anticipated changes due to demand hardening in the SFPUC's Wholesale and Retail Service Areas. Until agreement is reached, the current Tier 1 Shortage Plan will remain in effect.

3. The SFPUC will honor allocations of water among the Wholesale Customers ("Tier 2 Allocations") provided by BAWSCA or if unanimously agreed to by all Wholesale Customers. If BAWSCA or all Wholesale Customers do not provide the SFPUC with Tier 2 Allocations, then the SFPUC may make a final allocation decision after first meeting and discussing allocations with BAWSCA and the Wholesale Customers. For Regional Water System shortages in excess of 20%, San Francisco shall (a) follow the Tier 1 Shortage Plan allocations up to the 20% reduction, (b) meet and discuss how to implement incremental reductions above 20% with the Wholesale Customers, and (c) make a final determination of allocations above the 20% reduction. After the SFPUC has made the final allocation decision, the Wholesale Customers shall be free to challenge the allocation on any applicable legal or equitable basis.

4. San Francisco will use its best efforts to identify potential sources of dry year water supplies and establish the contractual and other means to access and deliver those supplies in sufficient quantity to meet a goal of not more than 20% system-wide shortage in any year of the design drought.

Wheeling of Water from Outside SFPUC System

Subject to the Wheeling Statute, the SFPUC will not deny use of Regional Water System unused capacity for wheeling when such capacity is available for wheeling purposes during periods when the SFPUC has declared a water shortage emergency under Water Code Section 350 if the following conditions are met:

A. The transferor pays reasonable charges incurred by the SFPUC as a result of the wheeling, including capital, operation, maintenance, administrative and replacement costs (as such are defined in the Wheeling Statute).

B. Wheeled water that is stored in the Regional Water System spills first.

C. Wheeled water will not unreasonably: (1) impact fish and wildlife resources in Regional Water System reservoirs; (2) diminish the quality of water delivered for consumptive uses; or (3) increase the risk of exotic species impairing Regional Water System operations. The transferor may at its own expense provide for treatment to mitigate these effects.

D. Priority will be given to wheeling by Wholesale Customers or BAWSCA over arrangements for third-party public entities.

Limits on New Customers

Until December 31, 2028, San Francisco will not enter into contracts to supply water to any entity other than a Wholesale Customer (whether permanent or temporary, firm or interruptible) unless:

1. It completes any necessary environmental review under CEQA of the proposed new wholesale water service obligations;

2. It concurrently completes any necessary environmental review under CEQA and commits to make both San José and Santa Clara permanent customers with Individual Supply Guarantees equal to at least 9 MGD; and

3. The Agreement is amended to incorporate any commitments to proposed new wholesale customers and to San José and Santa Clara, and to address the effects, if any, of the new customer(s) on water supply reliability, water quality and cost to existing customers of the Regional Water System.

As of January 1, 2029, San Francisco will not enter into contracts to supply water to any entity other than a Wholesale Customer (whether permanent or temporary, firm or interruptible) unless:

1. It completes any necessary environmental review under CEQA of the proposed new wholesale water service obligations;

2. It concurrently completes any necessary environmental review under CEQA and commits to make both San José and Santa Clara permanent customers with Individual Supply Guarantees equal to at least 9 MGD;

3. Doing so increases the reliability of the Regional Water System; and

4. The Agreement is concurrently amended (a) to reflect that increased reliability by means of an increased commitment by San Francisco to deliver water during Droughts and (b) to address the effects, if any, of the new customer(s) on water supply, water quality and cost to existing customers of the Regional Water System.

San Francisco may enter into new retail water service obligations outside of the City and County of San Francisco:

1. Only in Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Joaquin and Tuolumne Counties;

2. That are within or immediately adjacent to areas in which it currently serves other Retail Customers; and

3. Until the aggregate additional demand represented by the new retail customers reaches 0.5 MGD.

The limitations on serving new Retail Customers described in this subsection do not apply to historical obligations to supply water that may be contained in prior agreements between the SFPUC or its predecessor the Spring Valley Water Company, and individual users or property owners located adjacent to Regional Water System transmission pipelines.

Subject to completion of necessary environmental review under CEQA, San Francisco may at any time enter into water exchanges or cost sharing agreements with other water suppliers to enhance dry year or normal year water deliveries, provided that San Francisco cannot incur new water service obligations to such other water suppliers unless the requirements for taking on new wholesale customers are met.

New Sources of Water Supply to Maintain Supply Assurance

Sudden and unanticipated events may require San Francisco to act promptly to protect the health, safety and economic well-being of its Retail and Wholesale Customers. Such sudden events include, but are not limited to drought, earthquakes, terrorist acts, catastrophic failures of facilities owned and operated by San Francisco, and other natural or man-made events. If such events diminish San Francisco's ability to maintain the Supply Assurance, San Francisco may increase the Wholesale Revenue Requirement to pay for planning, evaluation and implementation of replacement sources of supply when such needs arise and without the prior approval of the Wholesale Customers.

Climate change, regulatory actions and other events may impact San Francisco's ability to maintain the Supply Assurance from its existing surface water supplies, but on timescales long enough to permit San Francisco to collaborate with its Wholesale Customers on how best to address possible impacts to water supply. If such events diminish San Francisco's ability to maintain the Supply Assurance, San Francisco may increase the Wholesale Revenue Requirement to pay for planning, evaluation and implementation of replacement sources of supply when such needs arise and without the prior approval of the Wholesale Customers.

New Sources of Water Supply to Increase Supply Assurance

San Francisco may offer to increase the Supply Assurance at the request of some or all of its Wholesale Customers. Costs associated with providing additional water from its existing water supplies in San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Counties shall be allocated to Wholesale and Retail Customers as described in the Agreement.

If San Francisco seeks to develop additional water supplies from new sources to increase the Supply Assurance available to Wholesale Customers, studies and resulting water supply projects will be conducted jointly with BAWSCA under separate agreement(s) specifying the purpose of the projects, the anticipated regional benefits

and how costs of studies and implementation will be allocated and charged. Nothing in the Agreement shall serve as precedent for the allocation of such new supply capital costs between Retail and Wholesale Customers or associated operational expenses, which shall only occur following approval of both parties and amendment of the Agreement, if necessary.

Interim Supply Limitation Imposed by SFPUC

In adopting the WSIP in Res. No. 08-0200, the Commission included full implementation of all proposed WSIP capital improvement projects to achieve level of service goals relating to public health, seismic safety, and delivery reliability, but decided to adopt a water supply element that includes the Interim Supply Limitation. The Interim Supply Limitation is allocated as follows between Retail and Wholesale Customers:

Retail Customers' allocation:	81 MGD
Wholesale Customers' allocation:	184 MGD

The Wholesale Customers' collective allocation of 184 MGD under the Interim Supply Limitation includes the demand of the cities of San José and Santa Clara, whose demand is not included in the Supply Assurance.

Transfers of Interim Supply Allocations

Any Wholesale Customer, including Hayward, may transfer a portion of its Interim Supply Allocation to one or more other Wholesale Customers. All Wholesale Customers are also eligible transferees, including California Water Service Company up to its Individual Supply Guarantee. Transfers of a portion of an Interim Supply Allocation must be prospective. The duration of a transfer cannot be less than the balance of the fiscal year. Transfers of portions of Interim Supply Allocations are subject to approval by the SFPUC. SFPUC review is limited to determining (1) whether a proposed transfer complies with the Act, and (2) whether the affected facilities in the Regional Water System have sufficient capacity to accommodate delivery of the increased amount of water to the proposed transferee.

Maintenance of Condition of Hetch Hetchy Reservoir

San Francisco may not change the existing condition of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir by:

1. Abandoning or decommissioning O'Shaughnessy Dam; or

2. Draining Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, except for purposes of (i) repair, rehabilitation, maintenance, improvement, or reconstruction of O'Shaughnessy Dam or appurtenances, (ii) supplying water to the Bay Area during drought, or (iii) meeting water release requirements under the Raker Act, or federal or state law unless the parties enter into an amendment to the Water Supply Agreement.

Environmental Enhancement Surcharge

For the duration of the Interim Supply Limitation, the Commission will establish the Environmental Enhancement Surcharge concurrently with the budget-coordinated rate process set forth in the Agreement. The monetary amount of the Environmental Enhancement Surcharge per volume of water, such as dollars per acre-foot, will be equivalent for Retail Customer use in excess of 81 MGD and Wholesale Customer use in excess of 184 MGD.

The Environmental Enhancement Surcharge will be levied only if and when combined Retail Customer and Wholesale Customer purchases exceed the Interim Supply Limitation of 265 MGD and if the fund described below has been established by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. In that event, the Environmental Enhancement Surcharge will apply to Retail Customers for use in excess of 81 MGD and to individual Wholesale Customers for use in excess of their Interim Supply Allocations established by the Commission.

1. Environmental Enhancement Surcharges related to the Retail Customers' use in excess of their 81 MGD Retail Customer Allocation will be paid by the SFPUC, and no portion of such surcharges may be allocated to Wholesale Customers. The method of recovering the Environmental

Enhancement Surcharges imposed upon Retail Customers shall be within the sole discretion of the SFPUC.

2. Environmental Enhancement Surcharges related to the individual Wholesale Customers' use in excess of their respective Interim Supply Allocations will be paid to the SFPUC by individual Wholesale Customers.

Environmental Enhancement Surcharges paid by the SFPUC and by Wholesale Customers will be placed into a restricted reserve fund. The SFPUC will request the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to establish this fund by ordinance and, if adopted, the fund will be subject to the following restrictions:

1. Interest earnings will stay in the reserve fund.

2. The reserve fund shall (a) be subject to automatic appropriation; (b) require unexpended and unencumbered fund balances to be carried forward from year to year; and (c) not be transferred to the San Francisco General Fund.

3. The reserve fund may be used only for specific environmental restoration and enhancement measures for the Sierra and local watersheds, such as those included in the Watershed Environmental Improvement Program.

4. Environmental Enhancement Surcharge proceeds shall be expended in an expeditious manner. Any Environmental Enhancement Surcharge proceeds that remain in the reserve fund as of December 31, 2018 shall be used to complete projects previously approved. Upon completion of the identified projects, the balance of any unexpended sums in the reserve fund shall be distributed to BAWSCA and the SFPUC in proportion to the total amount of surcharges assessed to the Wholesale and Retail Customers, respectively.

Specific uses of Environmental Enhancement Surcharges will be decided by the SFPUC and BAWSCA General Managers following input from environmental stakeholders and other interested members of the public. If parties are unable to agree, then they will jointly select a third person to participate in making the decision.

San José/Santa Clara Interim Supply Allocation and Process for Reduction/ Termination.

San Francisco will supply a combined annual average of 9 MGD to the cities of San José and Santa Clara through 2028. Water supplied by San Francisco may only be used in the existing defined service areas in the northern portions of San José and Santa Clara. San Francisco may reduce the quantity of water specified in this section when it establishes the Interim Supply Allocations for Wholesale Customers. The establishment of Interim Supply Allocations for San José and Santa Clara shall not be considered a reduction of supply, provided that the Interim Supply Allocations assigned to San José and Santa Clara do not effect a reduction greater than the aggregate average reduction in Individual Supply Guarantees for Wholesale Customers that have such guarantees.

San Francisco Decisions in 2028 Regarding Future Water Supply

By December 31, 2028, San Francisco will have completed any necessary CEQA review that is relevant to making San José and Santa Clara permanent customers of the Regional Water System and will decide whether or not to make San José and Santa Clara permanent customers of the Regional Water System. San Francisco will make San José and Santa Clara permanent customers only if, and to the extent that, San Francisco determines that Regional Water System long term water supplies are available. In the event that San Francisco decides to afford permanent status to San José and Santa Clara, the Agreement will be amended.

By December 31, 2028, San Francisco will have completed any necessary CEQA review and will decide how much water if any, in excess of the Supply Assurance it will supply to Wholesale Customers from the Regional Water System to meet their projected future water demands until the year 2040, and whether to offer a corresponding increase in the Supply Assurance as a result of its determination.

Retained Discretion of SFPUC and Wholesale Customers

The Agreement contemplates discretionary actions that the SFPUC and the Wholesale Customers may choose to take in the future that could result in physical changes to the environment ("Discretionary Actions"). The Discretionary Actions include decisions to:

1. Develop additional or alternate water resources by the SFPUC or one or more Wholesale Customers;

2. Implement the physical facilities comprising the WSIP by December 30, 2021;

3. Approve wheeling proposals by Wholesale Customers;

4. Approve new wholesale customers and water exchange or cost sharing agreements with other water suppliers;

5. Provide additional water to San José and/or Santa Clara;

6. Offer permanent status to San José and/or Santa Clara;

7. Reduce or terminate supply to San José and/or Santa Clara;

8. Provide additional water to Wholesale Customers in excess of the Supply Assurance to meet their projected future water demands;

9. Offer a corresponding volumetric increase in the Supply Assurance; and

10. Implement Hetch Hetchy Water and Power projects listed in the Agreement.

Wholesale Revenue Requirement

The Agreement shall be applicable only to the water rates charged by San Francisco to the Wholesale Customers. Nothing contained in the Agreement shall limit, constrain, or in any way affect the rates which San Francisco may charge for water sold to Retail Customers or the methodology by which such rates are determined.

The Agreement sets forth the method by which the Wholesale Customers' collective share of expenses incurred by the SFPUC in delivering water to them will be determined.

The Agreement implements two general principles as follows: (1) the Wholesale Customers should not pay for expenses of SFPUC operations from which they receive no benefit and (2) the Wholesale Customers should pay their share of expenses incurred by the SFPUC in delivering water to them on the basis of Proportional Annual Use unless otherwise explicitly provided in the Agreement.

To implement these general principles, the Wholesale Revenue Requirement will consist of, and be limited to the Wholesale Customers' shares of the following categories of expense:

1. Contribution to the capital cost of Water Enterprise New Regional Assets.

2. Water Enterprise operation and maintenance expenses, including power purchased from the Hetch Hetchy Enterprise that is used in the operation of the Water Enterprise.

3. Water Enterprise administrative and general expenses.

4. Water Enterprise property taxes.

5. The Water Enterprise's share of the Hetch Hetchy Enterprise's operation and maintenance, administrative and general, and property tax expenses.

6. The Water Enterprise's share of the Hetch Hetchy Enterprise's capital cost of New Assets classified as Water-Only and the Water-Related portion of Joint Assets.

In each of these cost categories, Direct Retail Expenses will be allocated entirely to Retail Customers. Direct Wholesale Expenses will be allocated entirely to the Wholesale Customers. Regional Expenses will be allocated between Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers.

For purposes of establishing the rates to be charged Wholesale Customers, expenses will be based on the budget for, and estimates of water purchases in, the following fiscal year. For purposes of accounting, the Wholesale Revenue Requirement will be determined on the basis of actual expenses incurred and actual water use.

In addition, rates charged to Wholesale Customers may include the Wholesale Customers' contribution to a Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve, which is not included in the Wholesale Revenue Requirement itself.

Capital Cost Contribution – New Regional Assets

The Wholesale Customers shall pay the wholesale share of Net Annual Debt Service for new Regional Assets.

1. The amount of Net Annual Debt Service for New Regional Assets will be determined for each series of Indebtedness issued. Until the proceeds of a particular series are Substantially Expended, the amount attributable to specific projects will be based on the expected use of proceeds shown in the "Certificate Regarding Use of Proceeds" executed by the SFPUC General Manager on behalf of the Commission in connection with the sale of the Indebtedness.

2. After the proceeds of a series are Substantially Expended, the SFPUC General Manager will prepare and execute a certificate showing the actual expenditure of proceeds at an allocation of Net Debt Service to New Regional Assets for a series of bonds will be used in the fiscal year in which the proceeds have been Substantially Expended and thereafter.

3. The Wholesale Customers' share of Net Annual Debt Service for the New Regional Assets that are categorized as Direct Wholesale will be 100 percent. (None of the projects in the WSIP are categorized as Direct Wholesale.) The Wholesale Customers' share of Net Annual Debt Service for all other New Regional Assets will be determined each year and will be equal to the Wholesale Customers' Proportional Annual Use.

4. If Indebtedness is issued by the SFPUC to refund the 2006 Revenue Bonds, Series A or to refund any other long-term Indebtedness issued after July 1, 2009, the Net Annual Debt Service attributable to proceeds used for refunding will be allocated on the same basis as the Indebtedness being refunded.

5. In addition to Net Debt Service, Wholesale Customers will pay a proportionate share of annual administrative costs associated with Indebtedness, such as bond trustee fees, credit rating agency fees, letter of credit issuer fees, San Francisco Revenue Bond Oversight Committee fees, etc., but only to the extent such fees are neither paid from proceeds of Indebtedness nor included in SFPUC operation and maintenance or administrative and general expenses.

The Wholesale Customers shall pay the wholesale share of the appropriation contained in the SFPUC annual budget for each year to be used to acquire or construct New Regional Assets.

The Wholesale Customers' share of the annual appropriation for revenue-funded New Regional Assets that are categorized as Direct Wholesale will be 100 percent. The Wholesale Customers' share of the annual appropriation for all other revenue-funded New Regional Assets will be determined each year and will be equal to the Wholesale

Customers' Proportional Annual Use in each fiscal year. The amount appropriated in each fiscal year for the wholesale share of New Regional Assets shall be contributed to the Wholesale Capital Fund.

Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Expenses

There are two steps involved in determining the amount of the Wholesale Customers' share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise expenses.

1. The first step is to determine the Water Enterprise's share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise operation expenses, maintenance expenses, administrative and general expenses, and property taxes.

2. The second step is to determine the Wholesale Customers' share of expenses allocable to the Water Enterprise.

The Water Enterprise's share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise expenses consist of 100 percent of Water-Only expenses and the Water-Related portion (45%) of Joint expenses.

The Wholesale Customers' share of the sum of the Water Enterprise's share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise expenses shall be calculated by multiplying that dollar amount by Adjusted Proportional Annual Use.

Wholesale Customers are also allocated a share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise capital costs. The components of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise capital costs are as follows:

1. The Water Enterprise will be assigned 100 percent of Net Annual Debt Service attributable to acquisition and construction of New Hetch Hetchy Enterprise assets that are Water-Only and the Water-Related portion (45 percent) of Net Annual Debt Service on New Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Joint assets.

2. The Water Enterprise will be assigned 100 percent of capital expenditures from revenues for New Hetch Hetchy Enterprise assets that are Water-Only and the Water-Related portion (45 percent) of such expenditures for new Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Joint assets.

The Wholesale Customers' share of the Net Annual Debt Service and revenue funded capital expenditures shall be calculated by multiplying that dollar amount by Adjusted Proportional Annual Use.

Additional Agreements Related to Financial Issues

The Wholesale Customers have no entitlement to any of the following sources of revenue to the SFPUC.

1. Revenues from leases or sales of SFPUC real property.

2. Revenues from other utility services such as the sale of electric power, natural gas and steam.

3. Revenues from the sale of water to customers and entities other than the Wholesale Customers.

4. Revenues earned from the investment of SFPUC funds other than funds contributed by the Wholesale Customers to the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve or the Wholesale Capital Fund. Wholesale Customers are also entitled to the benefit of earnings on proceeds of Indebtedness (through expenditure on New Regional Assets and /or application to Debt Service) and to interest on the Balancing Account.

5. Revenues not related to the sale of water.

The Wholesale Customers will not be charged with any of the following expenses:

1. Capital costs for assets constructed or acquired prior to July 1, 1984.

2. Expenses incurred by the SFPUC for generation and distribution of electric power, including Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Power-Only expenses and the Power-Related share of Hetch Hetchy Enterprise Joint expenses. An exception to this is Regional energy costs incurred by the Water Enterprise, for which Wholesale Customers are charged on the basis of Proportional Annual Use.

3. Expenses incurred by SFPUC in providing water to Retail Customers.

4. Expenses associated with the SFPUC's accruals or allocations for uncollectible Retail Water accounts.

5. Attorneys' fees and costs incurred by the Wholesale Customers that a court of competent jurisdiction orders San Francisco to pay as part of a final, binding judgment against San Francisco.

6. Any expenses associated with funding any reserves (other than the required Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve) accrued and not anticipated to be paid within one year unless such reserve is established by mutual agreement of the SFPUC and BAWSCA.

7. Any expenses accrued in respect to pending or threatened litigation, damage or personal injury claims or other loss contingencies unless projected to be paid within one year. Otherwise, such expenses will be charged to the Wholesale Customers when actually paid.

8. Any expenses associated with installing, relocating, enlarging, removing or modifying meters and service connections at the request of an individual Wholesale Customer.

9. The Retail Customers' portion of any Environmental Enhancement Surcharges imposed to enforce the Interim Supply Limitation.

The following payments by Wholesale Customers, individually or collectively, are not credited as Wholesale revenues.

1. Payments by individual Wholesale Customers of the Environmental Enhancement Surcharge imposed to enforce the Interim Supply Limitation.

2. Payments of attorneys' fees and costs incurred by San Francisco that a court of competent jurisdiction orders the Wholesale Customers to pay as part of a final, binding judgment against the Wholesale Customers.

3. Payments by individual Wholesale Customers for installation, relocation, enlargement, removal or modification of meters and service connections requested by, and charged to, a Wholesale Customer.

4. Payments applied to the amortization of the ending balance in the balancing account under the 1984 Agreement.

5. Payments of the Water Management Charge which are delivered to BAWSCA.

6. Payments directed to the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve.

7. Prepayments of certain capital and revenues payment.

The Wholesale Customers will receive a proportional benefit from funds received by the SFPUC from (a) governmental grants, rebates, reimbursements or other subventions, (b) private-sector grants for Regional capital

or operating purposes of the Water Enterprise and the Water-Only and Water-related portion of Joint Hetch Hetchy Water Enterprise expenses, or (c) a SFPUC use of taxable bonds.

The Wholesale Customers will receive a proportionate benefit from recovery of damages, including liquidated damages, by SFPUC from judgments against or settlements with contractors, suppliers, sureties, etc., related to Regional Water System projects and the Water-Only and Water-Related portion of Joint Hetch Hetchy Enterprise projects.

The SFPUC will continue to charge Wholesale Customers for assets acquired or constructed with proceeds of Indebtedness on which Wholesale Customers paid Debt Service during the Term of the Agreement on the "cash" basis (as opposed to the "utility" basis) after the expiration or earlier termination of the Agreement.

Rate Adjustments

Adjustments to the rates applicable to the Wholesale Customers, other than emergency rate increases and drought rate increases, shall be coordinated with the budget development process described in the Agreement.

The Commission may adjust the Wholesale Customers' rates in response to an Emergency that damages the Regional Water System and disrupts San Francisco's ability to maintain normal deliveries of water to Retail and Wholesale Customers. In such an Emergency, the Commission may adopt an emergency rate surcharge applicable to Wholesale Customers without following the budgeting procedures set forth in the Agreement, provided that any such rates surcharge imposed by the Commission shall be applicable to both Retail and Wholesale Customers and incorporate the same percentage increase for all customers. Any emergency rate surcharge adopted by the Commission shall remain in effect only until the next-budget coordinated rate-setting cycle.

If the Commission declares a water shortage emergency under Water Code Section 350, implements the Tier 1 Shortage Plan and imposes drought rates on Retail Customers, it may concurrently adjust wholesale rates independently of coordination with the annual budget process. Those adjustments may be designed to encourage water conservation and may constitute changes to the structure of the rates. Drought Rate payments and payments of excess use charges levied in accordance with the Tier 1 Shortage Plan constitute Wholesale Customer Revenue and count towards the Wholesale Revenue Requirement. The SFPUC may use these revenues to purchase additional water for the Wholesale Customers from the State Drought Water Bank or other willing seller.

Rate Structure

The Agreement is not intended and shall not be construed to limit the Commission's right (a) to adjust the structure of the rate schedule applicable to the Wholesale Customers (i.e., the relationship among the several charges set out therein) or (b) to add, delete, or change the various charges which make up the rate schedule, provided that neither such charges nor the structure of the rate schedule(s) applicable to the Wholesale Customers shall be arbitrary, unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory as among said customers. The SFPUC will give careful consideration to proposals for changes in the rate schedule made jointly by the Wholesale Customers but, subject to the limitations set out above, shall retain the sole and exclusive right to determine the structure of the rate schedule.

The SFPUC may recommend, and the Commission may adopt, changes in the structure of wholesale rates at any time. However, the new rate schedule implementing these changes will become effective at the beginning of the following fiscal year.

Balancing Account

After the close of each fiscal year, the SFPUC will compute the costs allocable to the Wholesale Customers for that fiscal year based on actual costs incurred by the SFPUC and actual amounts of water used by the Wholesale Customers and the Retail Customers. That amount will be compared to the amounts billed to the Wholesale Customers for that fiscal year (including any Excess Use Charges, but excluding revenues not credited to the Wholesale Revenue Requirement). The difference will be posted to a "balancing account" as a credit to, or charge against, the Wholesale Customers. Interest shall also be posted to the balancing account calculated by multiplying the amount of the opening

balance by the average net interest rate, certified by the Controller as earned in the San Francisco Treasury for the previous fiscal year on the San Francisco County Pooled Investment Account. Interest, when posted, will carry the same mathematical sign (whether positive or negative) as carried by the opening balance. The amount posted to the balancing account in each year shall be added to, or subtracted from, the balance in the account from previous years.

If the amount in the balancing account is owed to the Wholesale Customers (a positive balance), the SFPUC shall take it into consideration in establishing wholesale rates. However, the SFPUC need not apply the entire amount to reduce wholesale rates for the immediately ensuing year. Instead, the SFPUC may prorate a positive ending balance over a period of up to three successive years in order to avoid fluctuating decreases and increases in wholesale rates.

If the amount in the balancing account is owed to the SFPUC (a negative balance), the SFPUC shall not be obligated to apply all or any part of the negative balance in establishing wholesale rates for the immediately ensuring year. Instead, the SFPUC may prorate the negative balance in whole or in part over multiple years in order to avoid fluctuating increases and decreases in wholesale rates.

Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve

The SFPUC may include in wholesale rates for any fiscal year an additional dollar amount ("Wholesale Revenue Coverage"), which for any fiscal year shall equal the following:

1. The lesser of (i) 25% of the Wholesale Customers' share of Net Annual Debt Service for that fiscal year, or (ii) the amount necessary to meet the Wholesale Customers' proportionate share of Debt Service coverage required by then-current Indebtedness for that fiscal year, minus

2. A credit for (i) the actual amount previously deposited in the "Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve," (ii) accrued interest on the amounts on deposit in the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve, and (iii) an amount equal to any additional interest that would have accrued on the actual amounts previously deposited in the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve assuming no withdrawals had been made therefrom.

During each fiscal year, the SFPUC will set aside and deposit that portion of revenue equal to Wholesale Revenue Coverage into a separate account that the SFPUC will establish and maintain, to be known as the "Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve." Deposits into the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve shall be made no less frequently than monthly. The Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve shall be credited with interest. The SFPUC may use amounts in the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve for any lawful purpose. Any balance in the Wholesale Revenue Coverage Reserve in excess of the Wholesale Revenue Coverage amount as of the end of any fiscal year shall be applied as a credit against wholesale rates in the immediately following fiscal year unless otherwise directed by BAWSCA.

If, prior to expiration of the Term, the SFPUC determines that it would be in the best financial interest of both Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers of the Regional Water System for the Debt Service coverage requirement to be increased in one or more series of proposed new Indebtedness above 125%, or for the coverage covenant to be strengthened in other ways, it will provide a written report to BAWSCA. The report will contain (1) a description of proposed covenant(s) in the bond indenture; (2) an explanation of how savings are expected to be achieved (e.g., increase in the SFPUC's credit rating over the then-current level; ability to obtain credit enhancement, etc.); (3) the estimated all-in true interest cost savings; (4) a comparison of the Wholesale Revenue Requirements using the Debt Service coverage limitation and under the proposed methodology; and (5) a comparison of the respective monetary benefits expected to be received by both Retail and Wholesale Customers. The SFPUC and BAWSCA agree to meet and confer in good faith about the proposed changes.

Any increase in Debt Service coverage proposed by the SFPUC shall be commensurate with Proportional Water Use by Retail and Wholesale Customers. If the SFPUC demonstrates that an increase in Debt Service coverage will result in equivalent percentage reductions in total Wholesale and Retail Debt Service payments over the life of the proposed new Indebtedness, based on Proportional Water Use, BAWSCA may agree to a modification of the Wholesale Revenue Coverage requirement. If BAWSCA does not agree to a proposed modification in coverage requirements in the covenants for new Indebtedness, SFPUC may nevertheless proceed with the modification and the

issuance of new Indebtedness. Any Wholesale Customer, or BAWSCA, may challenge an increase in the Wholesale Revenue Requirement resulting from the modification in Debt Service coverage through arbitration. If the arbitrator finds that the increase in Debt Service coverage (1) did not and will not result in equivalent percentage reductions in total Wholesale and Retail Debt Service payments over the life of the proposed new Indebtedness, based on Proportional Water Use, or (2) was not commensurate with Proportional Water Use, the arbitrator may order the Wholesale Revenue Requirement to be recalculated both retrospectively and prospectively to eliminate the differential impact to Wholesale or Retail Customers.

Working Capital Requirement

The SFPUC maintains working capital in the form of unappropriated reserves for the purpose of bridging the gap between when the SFPUC incurs operating expenses required to provide service and when it receives revenues from its Retail and Wholesale Customers. The Wholesale Customers shall fund their share of working capital as part of the annual Wholesale Revenue Requirement calculation. The amount of wholesale working capital for which the Wholesale Customers will be responsible will be determined using the 60-day standard formula approach.

Applying this approach, annual wholesale working capital equals one-sixth of the wholesale allocation of operation and maintenance, administrative and general, and property tax expenses for the Water and Hetch Hetchy Enterprises. Wholesale working capital shall be calculated separately for the Water and Hetch Hetchy Enterprises.

Wholesale Capital Fund

The SFPUC shall establish a comparable Wholesale Revenue-Funded Capital Fund (Wholesale Capital Fund) to enable the Wholesale Customers to fund the wholesale share of revenue-funded New Regional Assets. The SFPUC may include in wholesale rates for any fiscal year an amount equal to the wholesale share of the SFPUC's appropriation for revenue funded New Regional Assets for that year, which sum will be credited to the Wholesale Capital Fund. The wholesale share of other sources of funding, where legally permitted and appropriately accounted for under GAAP, will also be credited to the Wholesale Capital Fund, together with interest earnings on the Wholesale Capital Fund balance.

The SFPUC will expend revenues appropriated and transferred to the Wholesale Capital Fund only on New Regional Assets.

In order to prevent the accumulation of an excessive unexpended and unencumbered surplus in the Wholesale Capital Fund, any excess fund balance will be transferred for the credit of the Wholesale Customers to the Balancing Account.

Arbitration and Judicial Review

All questions or disputes arising under the following subject areas shall be subject to mandatory, binding arbitration and shall not be subject to judicial determination:

1. the determination of the Wholesale Revenue Requirement, which shall include both the calculations used in the determination and the variables used in those calculations;

2. the SFPUC's adherence to accounting practices and conduct of the compliance audit; and

3. the SFPUC's classification of new assets for purposes of determining the Wholesale Revenue Requirement.

All other questions or disputes arising under this Agreement shall be subject to judicial determination. Disputes about the scope of arbitrability shall be resolved by the courts.

Preservation of Water Rights; Notice of Water Rights Proceedings

It is the intention of San Francisco to preserve all of its water rights, irrespective of whether the water held under such water rights is allocated under the Agreement. Nothing in the Agreement shall be construed as an abandonment, or evidence of an intent to abandon, any of the water rights that San Francisco presently possesses.

Reservations of, and Limitations on, Claims

The 1984 Agreement resolved a civil action brought against San Francisco by certain of the Wholesale Customers. Plaintiffs in that action contended that they, and other Wholesale Customers that are municipalities or special districts, were "co-grantees" within the meaning of Section 8 of the Act and were entitled to certain rights, benefits and privileges by virtue of that status. San Francisco disputed those claims.

Nothing in the Agreement, or in the Individual Water Sales Contracts, shall be construed or interpreted in any way to affect the ultimate resolution of the controversy between the Parties concerning whether any of the Wholesale Customers are "co-grantees" under the Act and, if so, what rights, benefits and privileges accrue to them by reason of that claimed status.

The following claims, which San Francisco disputes, are reserved but may not be asserted during the Term (or portions thereof, as indicated):

1. The Wholesale Customers' claim that the Act entitles them to water at cost.

2. The Wholesale Customers' claim that San Francisco is obligated under the Act or state law to supply them with additional water in excess of the Supply Assurance. This claim may not be asserted unless and until San Francisco decides not to meet projected water demands of Wholesale Customers in excess of the Supply Assurance.

3. The claim by San José and Santa Clara that they are entitled under the Act, or any other federal or state law, to permanent, non-interruptible status and to be charged rates identical to those charged other Wholesale Customers. This claim may not be asserted unless and until San Francisco notifies San José or Santa Clara that it intends to interrupt or terminate water deliveries.

4. The Wholesale Customers' claim that the SFPUC is not entitled to impose a surcharge for lost power generation revenues attributable to furnishing water in excess of the Supply Assurance. This claim may not be asserted unless and until SFPUC furnishes water in excess of the Supply Assurance during the Term and also includes such a surcharge in the price of such water.

5. Claims by Wholesale Customers (other than San José and Santa Clara, whose service areas are fixed) that SFPUC is obligated under the Act or state law to furnish water, within their Individual Supply Guarantee, for delivery to customers outside their existing service area and that Wholesale Customers are entitled to enlarge their service areas to supply those customers. Such claims may be asserted only after SFPUC's denial of, or failure for six months to act on, a written request by a Wholesale Customer to expand its service area.

The Wholesale Customers (and the SFPUC, where specified) will refrain from the following activities during the Term (or portions thereof, as specified):

1. The Wholesale Customers and the SFPUC will not contend before any court, administrative agency or legislative body or committee that the methodology for determining the Wholesale Revenue Requirement (or the requirements for (a) amortization of the ending balance under the 1984 Agreement, or (b) contribution to the Wholesale Revenue Coverage) determined in accordance with the Agreement violates the Act or any other provision of federal law, state law, or San Francisco's City Charter, or is unfair, unreasonable or unlawful.

2. The Wholesale Customers will not challenge the transfer of funds by the SFPUC to any other San Francisco City department or fund, provided such transfer complies with the San Francisco City Charter. The transfer of its funds, whether or not permitted by the City Charter, will not excuse the SFPUC from its failure to perform any obligation imposed by the Agreement.

3. The Wholesale Customers and the SFPUC will not assert monetary claims against one another based on the 1984 Agreement other than otherwise arbitral claims arising from the three fiscal years immediately preceding the start of the Term (i.e., Fiscal Years 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09).

The Wholesale Customers do not, by executing the Agreement, concede the legality of the SFPUC's establishing Interim Supply Allocations or imposing Environmental Enhancement Surcharges on water use in excess of such allocations. Any Wholesale Customer may challenge such allocation when imposed and/or such surcharges if and when levied, in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The furnishing of water in excess of the Supply Assurance by San Francisco to the Wholesale Customers shall not be deemed or construed to be a waiver by San Francisco of its claim that it has no obligation under any provision of law to supply such water to the Wholesale Customers, nor shall it constitute a dedication by San Francisco to the Wholesale Customers of such water.

Prohibition of Assignment

The Agreement shall be binding on, and shall inure to the benefit of, the Wholesale Customers and San Francisco, and their respective successors and permitted assigns. Each Wholesale Customer agrees that it will not transfer or assign any rights or privileges under the Agreement, either in whole or in part, or make any transfer of all or any part of its water system or allow the use thereof in any manner whereby any provision of the Agreement will not continue to be binding on it, its assignee or transferee, or such use of the system. Any assignment or transfer in violation of this covenant, and any assignment or transfer that would result in the supply of water in violation of the Act, shall be void.

Nothing shall prevent any Wholesale Customer (except the California Water Service Company and Stanford) from entering into a joint powers agreement or a municipal or multi-party water district with any other Wholesale Customer (except the two listed above) to exercise the rights and obligations granted to and imposed upon the Wholesale Customers hereunder, nor shall this section prevent any Wholesale Customer (except the two listed above) from succeeding to the rights and obligations of another Wholesale Customer hereunder as long as the Wholesale Service Area served by the Wholesale Customers involved in the succession is not thereby enlarged.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

APPENDIX C

SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Delivering High-Quality
Water Every Day.

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission



Water Enterprise

Financial Statements June 30, 2024 and 2023
(With Independent Auditor's Report Thereon)

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE

Table of Contents

	Page
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Management's Discussion and Analysis (Unaudited)	3
Financial Statements:	
Statements of Net Position	17
Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position	19
Statements of Cash Flows	20
Notes to Financial Statements	22
Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With *Government Auditing Standards*	84

mgo. | Certified Public Accountants

Independent Auditor's Report

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

Report on the Audit of the Financial Statements

Opinion

We have audited the financial statements of the San Francisco Water Enterprise (the Enterprise), an enterprise fund of the City and County of San Francisco (City), as of and for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, and the related notes to the financial statements, as listed in the table of contents.

In our opinion, the accompanying financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Enterprise as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, and the changes in its financial position and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAS) and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States (*Government Auditing Standards*). Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements section of our report. We are required to be independent of the Enterprise, and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements relating to our audit. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Emphasis of Matter

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the Enterprise and do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the City, as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the changes in its financial position, or, where applicable, its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

Responsibilities of Management for the Financial Statements

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

Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not absolute assurance and therefore is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with GAAS and *Government Auditing Standards*

will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control. Misstatements are considered material if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, they would influence the judgment made by a reasonable user based on the financial statements.

In performing an audit in accordance with GAAS and *Government Auditing Standards*, we:

- Exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.
- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, and design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks. Such procedures include examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements.
- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Enterprise's internal control. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We are required to communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit, significant audit findings, and certain internal control-related matters that we identified during the audit.

Required Supplementary Information

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the management's discussion and analysis, as listed in the table of contents, be presented to supplement the financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and, although not a part of the financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with GAAS, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audits of the financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated November 12, 2024 on our consideration of the Enterprise's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the Enterprise's internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the Enterprise's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP

Walnut Creek, California
November 12, 2024

This section presents management's analysis of the San Francisco Water Enterprise's (the Enterprise) financial condition and activities as of and for fiscal years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023. Management's Discussion and Analysis (MDA) is intended to serve as an introduction to the Enterprise's financial statements. This information should be read in conjunction with the audited financial statements that follow this section. All dollar amounts, unless otherwise noted, are expressed in thousands of dollars.

The information in this MDA is presented under the following headings:

- Organization and Business
- Overview of the Financial Statements
- Financial Analysis
- Capital Assets
- Debt Administration
- Rates and Charges
- Request for Information

Organization and Business

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC or the Commission) is a department of the City and County of San Francisco (the City) that is responsible for the maintenance, operation, and development of three utility enterprises: Water (the Enterprise), Hetch Hetchy Water and Power and CleanPowerSF, and Wastewater. The Enterprise collects, transmits, treats, and distributes high-quality drinking water to a total population of approximately 2.7 million people, including retail customers in the City and wholesale customers located in San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Alameda Counties. The Enterprise sold approximately 174 million gallons of water per day in the year ended June 30, 2024. Approximately 70% of the water delivered by the Enterprise is to wholesale customers. Retail customers use the remaining 30% and are primarily San Francisco consumers, including residential, commercial, industrial, and governmental users. Wholesale customers include cities, water districts, one private utility, and one non-profit university. Service to these customers is provided pursuant to the 25-year Amended and Restated Water Supply Agreement (WSA), commenced on July 1, 2009, which established the basis for determining the costs of wholesale service.

Overview of the Financial Statements

The Enterprise's financial statements include the following:

Statements of Net Position present information on the Enterprise's assets, deferred outflows, liabilities, and deferred inflows as of year-end, with the difference reported as net position. Over time, increases or decreases in net position may serve as a useful indicator of whether the financial position of the Enterprise is improving or worsening.

While the *Statements of Net Position* provide information about the nature and amount of resources and obligations as of year-end, the *Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position* present the results of the Enterprise's operations over the course of the fiscal year and information as to how the net position changed during the year. These statements can be used as an indicator of the extent to which the Enterprise has successfully recovered its costs through user fees and other charges. All changes in net position are reported during the period in which the underlying event giving rise to the change occurs, regardless of the timing of the related cash flows. Thus, revenues and expenses are reported in these statements from some items that will result in cash flows in future fiscal periods, such as delayed collection of operating revenues and the expenses of employee earned but unused vacation leave.

The *Statements of Cash Flows* present changes in cash and cash equivalents resulting from operational, capital financing, non-capital financing, and investing activities. These statements summarize the annual flow of cash receipts and cash payments, without consideration of the timing of the event giving rise to the obligation or receipt and exclude non-cash accounting measures of depreciation or amortization of assets.

The *Notes to Financial Statements* provide information that is essential to a full understanding of the financial statements that is not displayed on the face of the financial statements.

Financial Analysis

Financial Highlights for Fiscal Year 2024

- Total assets exceeded total liabilities by $641,038.
- Net position increased by $57,575 or 8.3% during the fiscal year.
- Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization increased by $125,515 or 2.2% to $5,778,467.
- Current and other assets increased by $174,613 or 25.3% mainly due to increases of reimbursements receivable relating to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement project for Clean Water State Revolving Funds (SRF) Loans and restricted cash from the issuances of the 2023 Series AB and 2023 Series CD bonds.
- Operating revenues decreased by $14,201 or 2.1% to $676,890.
- Operating expenses increased by $69,103 or 15.0% to $529,356.

Financial Highlights for Fiscal Year 2023

- Total assets exceeded total liabilities by $565,858.
- Net position increased by $58,646 or 9.3% during the fiscal year.
- Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization increased by $30,969 or 0.6% to $5,652,952.
- Current and other assets decreased by $99,872 or 12.6% mainly due to bond principal and interest payments, capital project expenses, and payments for salaries.
- Operating revenues increased by $117,974 or 20.6% to $691,091.
- Operating expenses increased by $58,489 or 14.6% to $460,253.

Financial Position

The following table summarizes the Enterprise's net position.

Table 1
Comparative Condensed Net Position
June 30, 2024, 2023, and 2022

	2024	2023	2022	2024-2023 Change	2023-2022 Change
Total assets:					
Current and other assets	$ 865,690	691,077	790,949	174,613	(99,872)
Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization	5,778,467	5,652,952	5,621,983	125,515	30,969
Total assets	6,644,157	6,344,029	6,412,932	300,128	(68,903)
Deferred outflows of resources:					
Unamortized loss on refunding of debt	89,186	124,635	139,481	(35,449)	(14,846)
Pensions	93,526	70,101	52,852	23,425	17,249
Other postemployment benefits	29,974	28,616	32,445	1,358	(3,829)
Total deferred outflows of resources	212,686	223,352	224,778	(10,666)	(1,426)
Liabilities:					
Current liabilities:					
Revenue bonds	138,140	135,095	125,285	3,045	9,810
Certificates of participation	3,402	3,267	3,138	135	129
Commercial paper	190,000	—	206,297	190,000	(206,297)
State revolving fund loans	—	—	3,283	—	(3,283)
Other liabilities	148,337	148,547	182,349	(210)	(33,802)
Subtotal current liabilities	479,879	286,909	520,352	192,970	(233,443)
Long-term liabilities:					
Revenue bonds	4,826,497	4,575,751	4,735,650	250,746	(159,899)
Certificates of participation	85,830	89,232	92,499	(3,402)	(3,267)
Commercial paper	—	371,459	—	(371,459)	371,459
State revolving fund loans	259,970	163,627	118,478	96,343	45,149
Arbitrage rebate payable	869	—	—	869	—
Other liabilities	350,074	291,193	218,669	58,881	72,524
Subtotal long-term liabilities	5,523,240	5,491,262	5,165,296	31,978	325,966
Total liabilities:					
Revenue bonds	4,964,637	4,710,846	4,860,935	253,791	(150,089)
Certificates of participation	89,232	92,499	95,637	(3,267)	(3,138)
Commercial paper	190,000	371,459	206,297	(181,459)	165,162
State revolving fund loans	259,970	163,627	121,761	96,343	41,866
Arbitrage rebate payable	869	—	—	869	—
Other liabilities	498,411	439,740	401,018	58,671	38,722
Total liabilities	6,003,119	5,778,171	5,685,648	224,948	92,523
Deferred inflows of resources:					
Unamortized gain on refunding of debt	31,854	—	—	31,854	—
Pensions	13,305	28,504	248,704	(15,199)	(220,200)
Leases	36,583	41,558	44,583	(4,975)	(3,025)
Other postemployment benefits	22,334	27,075	25,348	(4,741)	1,727
Total deferred inflows of resources	104,076	97,137	318,635	6,939	(221,498)
Net position:					
Net investment in capital assets	350,430	460,213	512,313	(109,783)	(52,100)
Restricted for debt service	44,724	14,625	14,671	30,099	(46)
Restricted for capital projects	200,632	56,822	17,085	143,810	39,737
Restricted for other purposes	—	—	100,407	—	(100,407)
Unrestricted	153,862	160,413	(11,049)	(6,551)	171,462
Total net position	$ 749,648	692,073	633,427	57,575	58,646

(Continued)

Net Position, Fiscal Year 2024

For the period ended June 30, 2024, the Enterprise's assets and deferred outflows of resources exceeded liabilities and deferred inflows of resources by $749,648. Total net position increased from prior year by $57,575 or 8.3% (see Table 1). Increases of $289,462 in assets and deferred outflows of resources, and increases of $231,887 in liabilities and deferred inflows of resources are described below.

Current and other assets are primarily comprised of restricted and unrestricted balances of cash, receivables for water deliveries and services, interest and lease receivables, interfund receivables due from other governmental agencies, prepaids, and inventory.

During the fiscal year 2024, current and other assets increased by $174,613 or 25.3%. The increases included $93,433 for reimbursements receivable from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) State Revolving Funds Loan relating to the SF Westside Recycled Water and the Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects, $53,237 in restricted and unrestricted cash and investments mainly due to the issuances of Series 2023 Series AB and 2023 Series CD bonds, $16,069 in Wholesale Balancing Account receivable (see Note 11 for details), $15,531 in charges for services receivable due to more billings than collections and adopted rate increases of 9.7% for wholesale customers and 5.0% for retail customers, $1,264 in interest receivable mainly due to higher interest rates, $505 in notes receivable from the sale of the Balboa Reservoir due to interest accruals, $366 due from other governments for a Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster cost recovery relating to the 2020 Wildfires Santa Clara Fence project, and $275 in restricted interest and other receivables mainly due to increases in capacity fees. These increases were offset by decreases of $4,567 in leases receivable due to payments received, $1,121 in prepaid expenses of multiple software licensing and membership fees, $366 in inventory due to more issuances than purchases during the fiscal year, and $13 for custom work projects due from the Department of Public Works (DPW).

Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization, increased by $125,515 or 2.2% mainly from the San Joaquin Pipeline Valve and Safe Entry Improvement and Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects. The largest portion of the Enterprise's net position of $350,430 or 46.7% represents net investment in capital assets (see Capital Assets section of the MDA for more information), which decreased by $109,783 or 23.9% from prior year's $460,213. The change was explained by an increase of $235,298 in liabilities mainly from the issuances of 2023 Series AB and 2023 Series CD bonds, and additional State Revolving Funds Loans relating to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects, offset by an increase of $125,515 in capital assets mainly from additional assets placed into service.

Deferred outflows of resources decreased by $10,666 due to a decrease of $35,449 in unamortized loss on refunding of debt mainly from defeasance of refunding loss by the 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds, offset by increases of $23,425 from pensions and $1,358 in OPEB benefits based on actuarial estimates.

Total liabilities increased by $224,948 which was due to increases of $253,791 in outstanding revenue bonds mainly from the issuances of 2023 Series AB revenue bonds and 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds, $96,343 in SRF Loans payable due to additional loans relating to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects, $37,300 in pensions based on actuarial estimates, $9,700 in OPEB liabilities based on actuarial estimates, $6,442 in interest payable mainly from the issuances of 2023 Series AB revenue bonds and 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds, $3,148 in damage claims based on actuarial reports, $2,055 in accrued payroll, vacation and sick leave based on unused leave and a 4.75% cost-of-living adjustment, $1,715 in restricted and unrestricted payables due to higher year end

expense accruals for operating activities as compared to prior year, $1,267 in accrued workers' compensation based on actuarial estimates, $1,073 in unearned revenues mainly for the water utility California state arrearages relief grant received, and $869 in arbitrage rebate payable mainly for the 2023 Series A bonds. These increases were offset by decreases of $181,459 in commercial paper from refunding by the 2023 Series AB revenue bonds, $3,267 in certificates of participation from repayment and amortization of premium, $2,440 payment to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) for a settlement payable relating to the Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement project, $1,189 in leases liability due to payments in the current year, and $400 in subscription liability from payments in the current year.

Deferred inflows of resources increased by $6,939 due to an increase of $31,854 in unamortized gain on refunding of debt from the issuance of 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds, offset by decreases of $15,199 related to pensions based on actuarial estimates, $4,975 in leases due to fewer leases, and $4,741 in OPEB benefits based on actuarial estimates.

Net Position, Fiscal Year 2023

For the period ended June 30, 2023, the Enterprise's assets and deferred outflows of resources exceeded liabilities and deferred inflows of resources by $692,073. Total net position increased from prior year by $58,646 or 9.3% (see Table 1). The increase in net position was the result of a decrease of $128,975 in liabilities and deferred inflows of resources offset by a decrease of $70,329 in assets and deferred outflows of resources.

Current and other assets are primarily comprised of restricted and unrestricted balances of cash, receivables for water deliveries and services, interest and lease receivables, interfund receivables due from other governmental agencies, prepaids, and inventory.

During the fiscal year 2023, current and other assets decreased by $99,872 or 12.6%. The decreases included $100,407 in restricted net pension asset based on actuarial estimates, $45,106 in restricted and unrestricted cash and investments mainly due to debt principal and interest payments, capital projects spending, payments for salaries and goods and services, $6,625 in prepaid expenses of multiple software licensing and membership fees, $2,535 in lease receivable due to lease payments received, $632 in restricted interest and other receivables mainly due to capacity fees, and $63 mainly for custom work projects due from the Department of Public Works (DPW). These decreases were offset by increases of $28,594 for a reimbursement receivable from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) State Revolving Funds Loan relating to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects, $11,007 in notes receivable from the sale of the Balboa Reservoir, $10,052 in Wholesale Balancing Account receivable (see Note 11 for details), $2,249 in interest receivable mainly due to higher interest rates, $2,205 in charges for services receivable mainly due to a 15.9% rate increase for wholesale customers beginning July 1, 2022, and $1,389 in inventory due to more purchases than issuances during the fiscal year.

Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization, increased by $30,969 or 0.6% mainly due to Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects. The largest portion of the Enterprise's net position of $460,213 or 66.5% represents net investment in capital assets (see Capital Assets section of the MDA for more information), which decreased by $52,100 or 10.2% from prior year's $512,313 The change was explained by an increase of $83,069 in liabilities related to capital assets mainly from State Revolving Funds Loan relating to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects, offset by a $30,969 increase in capital assets mainly from increased buildings, structures and improvements.

Deferred outflows of resources decreased by $1,426 due to decreases of $14,846 from amortization for unamortized loss on refunding and $3,829 in OPEB obligations based on actuarial estimates, offset by an increase of $17,249 from pensions based on actuarial estimates.

Total liabilities increased by $92,523, which was due to increases of $165,162 in commercial paper from additional principal issuances, $115,343 in pensions based on actuarial reports, $41,866 in SRF loan payable due to additional loans related to the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects, $15,329 in restricted and unrestricted payables due to higher year end expense accruals for capital projects as compared to prior year, $4,486 in OPEB obligations based on actuarial estimates, $2,440 payable to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for a settlement payable relating to the Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement project, $1,168 in accrued payroll, vacation and sick leave due to cost of living adjustments and unused leave, $1,147 in lease liability from additional leases, and $762 in workers' compensation based on actuarial estimates. These increases were offset by decreases of $150,089 in outstanding revenue bonds from $125,284 in bond repayment, $24,813 in bond premium amortization, offset by $8 in bond discount amortization, $79,150 in the Wholesale Balancing Account liability (see Note 11 for details), $16,444 in general liability based on actuarial report, $5,160 in unearned revenues mainly from lower custom work deposits and reduced Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) Bond Surcharges, $3,138 in certificates of participation from $3,124 in principal repayment and $14 in amortization of premium, $848 in subscription liabilities from the implementation of GASB Statement No. 96 – *SBITAs,* and $351 in interest payable from lower outstanding revenue bonds.

Deferred inflows of resources decreased by $221,498 due to decreases of $220,200 related to pensions based on actuarial estimates and $3,025 in leases based on Controller's Office GASB 87 lease calculations, offset by an increase of $1,727 in OPEB obligations based on actuarial estimates.

Results of Operations

The following table summarizes the Enterprise's revenues, expenses, and changes in net position.

Table 2
Comparative Condensed Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position
June 30, 2024, 2023, and 2022

	2024	2023	2022	2024-2023 Change	2023-2022 Change
Revenues:					
Charges for services	$ 650,233	661,241	539,526	(11,008)	121,715
Rents and concessions	8,556	13,282	13,765	(4,726)	(483)
Other operating revenues	18,101	16,568	19,826	1,533	(3,258)
Interest and investment income (loss)	25,097	11,156	(10,896)	13,941	22,052
Other non-operating revenues	42,071	40,679	41,871	1,392	(1,192)
Total revenues	744,058	742,926	604,092	1,132	138,834
Expenses:					
Operating expenses	529,356	460,253	401,764	69,103	58,489
Interest expenses	222,055	214,913	213,681	7,142	1,232
Amortization of premium, discount, refunding loss, and issuance costs	(13,825)	(9,971)	(9,875)	(3,854)	(96)
Non-operating expenses	1,760	1,775	828	(15)	947
Total expenses	739,346	666,970	606,398	72,376	60,572
Change in net position before capital contributions and transfers	4,712	75,956	(2,306)	(71,244)	78,262
Capital contributions	53,599	2,717	—	50,882	2,717
Transfers from the City and County of San Francisco	505	5	15,035	500	(15,030)
Transfers to the City and County of San Francisco	(1,241)	(20,032)	(30,666)	18,791	10,634
Capital contributions and net transfers	52,863	(17,310)	(15,631)	70,173	(1,679)
Change in net position	57,575	58,646	(17,937)	(1,071)	76,583
Net position at beginning of year	692,073	633,427	651,364	58,646	(17,937)
Net position at end of year	$ 749,648	692,073	633,427	57,575	58,646

(Continued)

Results of Operations, Fiscal Year 2024

The Enterprise's total revenues of $744,058 for the year represented an increase of $1,132 or 0.2% from prior year (see Table 2). Increases included $13,941 from interest and investment income, $1,533 in other operating revenues, and $1,392 in other non-operating revenues. These increases were offset by decreases of $11,008 in charges for services and $4,726 in rents and concessions.

Charges for services were $650,233, a decrease of $11,008 or 1.7%, mainly due to a higher Wholesale Balancing Account adjustment to increase revenues in prior year, offset by adopted rate increases of 9.7% for wholesale customers and 5% for retail customers beginning July 1, 2023. Rents and concessions were $8,556, a decrease of $4,726 or 35.6%, mainly due to funding allocation for low-income customer assistance programs. Other operating revenues were $18,101, an increase of $1,533 or 9.3%, mainly due to increased consumption by other City departments and an adopted rate increase of 5% beginning July 1, 2023. Interest and investment income were $25,097, an increase of $13,941 or 125.0%, mainly due to higher unrealized gains in the current year compared to prior year and higher interest rates. Other non-operating revenues were $42,071, an increase of $1,392 or 3.4%, mainly due to grants for COVID-19 pandemic related water utility arrearages relief and disaster cost recovery for the 2020 Wildfires Santa Clara Fence project.

The Enterprise's total expenses were $739,346, an increase of $72,376 or 10.9%. Operating expenses were $529,356, an increase of $69,103 or 15.0%, resulting from increases of $30,435 in general and administrative expenses mainly due to an increase in judgment and claims expenses based on actuarial estimates, $24,070 in personnel services mainly due to pension expenses based on actuarial estimates, $11,054 in other operating expenses mainly due SF Recycled Water and Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects spending, $3,209 in contractual services mainly for construction expenses, and $3,149 in materials and supplies mainly for water treatment supplies. These increases were offset by decreases of $2,272 for services provided by other departments mainly from lower water assessment fees paid to Hetch Hetchy Water, and $542 in depreciation. Interest expenses increased by $7,142 compared to prior year, mainly due to the issuances of 2023 Series AB revenue bonds and 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds. Amortization of bond premium, discount, refunding loss/gain and issuance costs increased by $3,854 due to the issuances of 2023 Series AB revenue bonds and 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds. Non-operating expenses decreased by $15 mainly due to higher rebates provided to customers in the prior year.

Capital contributions of $53,599 were received from developers for assets relating mainly to the Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island, and Pier 70 Development project. Transfer in of $505 from the General Fund included $500 for research on environmental impacts in Hunter's Point Shipyard and $5 for the Mayor's Office's minimum compensation ordinance. Transfer out of $1,241 included $1,167 to the Arts Commission for the arts enrichment fund, $42 to Hetch Hetchy Water to fund various Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects, and $32 to the Office of the City Administrator for the Enterprise's contribution to the Surety Bond Program.

Results of Operations, Fiscal Year 2023

The Enterprise's total revenues of $742,926 for the year represented an increase of $138,834 or 23.0% from prior year (see Table 2). Increases included $121,715 from charges for services, and $22,052 in interest and investment income. These increases were offset by decreases of $3,258 in other operating revenues, $1,192 in other non-operating revenues, and $483 in rents and concessions.

Charges for services were $661,241, an increase of $121,715 or 22.6% mainly due to an adopted rate increase of 15.9% for wholesale customers and a 5% drought surcharge for retail customers beginning July

(Continued)

1, 2022. Rents and concessions were $13,282, a decrease of $483 or 3.5% mainly due to lease terminations. Other operating revenues were $16,568, a decrease of $3,258 or 16.4% mainly due to decreased consumption by other City departments and fewer capacity fee applications. Interest and investment income was $11,156, an increase of $22,052 or 202.4% due to prior year unrealized losses and higher interest earned on pooled cash. Other non-operating revenues were $40,679, a decrease of $1,192 or 2.8% due to an accrued settlement and water utility arrearages relief grant received in prior year.

The Enterprise's total expenses were $666,970, an increase of $60,572 or 10.0%. Operating expenses were $460,253, an increase of $58,489 or 14.6%, as a result of increases of $52,324 in personnel services mainly due to pensions based on actuarial estimates, $6,937 in depreciation from additional capital assets placed into service, $6,603 in services provided by other departments mainly for higher water assessments fees paid to Hetch Hetchy Water, $4,357 in contractual services mainly for custom work and professional and specialized service charges, and increase of $4,327 in materials and supplies mainly for water treatment supplies. These increases were offset by a decrease of $16,059 in general administrative and other expenses mainly from judgment and claims. Interest expenses increased by $1,232, compared to prior year, mainly due to increased commercial paper interest. Amortization of bond premium, discount, refunding loss and issuance costs increased by $96 mainly due to amortization of bond refunding loss. Non-operating expenses increased by $947 mainly for youth employment and employment projects.

Transfer in of $5 from the General Fund was for the Mayor's Office's minimum compensation ordinance. Transfer out of $20,032 included $20,000 to Hetch Hetchy Water to fund various Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects, and $32 to the Office of the City Administrator for the Enterprise's contribution to the Surety Bond Program. Capital contribution of $2,717 was received from a developer for assets relating to the Potrero HOPE SF and Sunnydale HOPE SF projects.

Capital Assets

The following table summarizes changes in the Enterprise's capital assets.

Table 3
Capital Assets, Net of Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization
As of June 30, 2024, 2023, and 2022

	2024	2023	2022	2024-2023 Change	2023-2022 Change
Facilities, improvements, machinery, and equipment	$ 5,052,639	5,005,667	5,056,747	46,972	(51,080)
Intangible assets	2,657	2,331	3,152	326	(821)
Land and rights-of-way	113,322	113,322	113,441	—	(119)
Construction work in progress	606,804	526,994	444,254	79,810	82,740
Right-to-use lease and subscription assets	3,045	4,638	4,389	(1,593)	249
Total	$ 5,778,467	5,652,952	5,621,983	125,515	30,969

Capital Assets, Fiscal Year 2024

The Enterprise has net capital assets of $5,778,467 invested in a broad range of utility capital assets as of June 30, 2024 (see Table 3). The investment in capital assets includes land, facilities, improvements, water treatment plants, aqueducts, water transmission, distribution mains, water storage facilities, pump stations, water reclamation facilities, machinery, and equipment. The Enterprise's net revenue and long-term debt are used to finance capital investments. Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization, increased by $125,515 from the prior year. Facilities, improvements, machinery, and equipment increased by $46,972 mainly due to additions relating to various Water Main Replacement projects. Intangible assets

(Continued)

increased by $326 mainly due to Maximo improvements and Software as a Service Applications additions. Land and rights-of-way was unchanged. Construction work in progress increased by $79,810 mainly from the San Joaquin Pipeline Valve and Safe Entry Improvements and Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects. Right-to-use lease and subscription assets decreased by $1,593 due to fewer leases and subscription assets.

As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the Enterprise had capital commitments of $225,678 and $187,936, respectively.

Major additions to construction work in progress during the year ended June 30, 2024 include the following:

San Joaquin Pipeline Valve and Safe Entry Improvements	$	21,253
Mountain Tunnel Improvements		18,114
New City Distribution Division Headquarters		10,999
2023 March Winter Storm Joint Project		10,622
Lead Component Service Program		10,419
Water Main Replacement - WD-2847 Laidley/Castro to Harper/Bemis/Miguel/Various Side		8,038
College Hill Reservoir Outlet and Pipeline		7,960
New services for water installation		7,195
Water Main Replacement - WD-2859 Taraval Segment B		6,482
Regional Groundwater Storage and Recovery		6,426
Skyline Ridge Trail		6,336
Water Main Replacement - WD-2801 Mariposa to Cesar Chavez/York/Hampshire Streets		6,289
Water Main Replacement - WD-2843 Diamond/27th/28th/Duncan Streets		5,675
Westside Recycled Water Project		5,444
San Andreas Reservoir Road Improvements		5,358
Other project additions individually below $5,000		84,360
Total	$	220,970

Major land, depreciable facilities, improvements, intangible assets, machinery, and equipment placed in service, including transfers of completed projects from construction work in progress, during the year ended June 30, 2024 include the following:

Water Main Replacement - WD-2859 Taraval Segment B	$	15,052
Water Main Replacement - WD-2843 Diamond/27th/28th/Duncan Streets		11,814
Water Main Replacement - WD-2847 Laidley/Castro to Harper/Bemis/Miguel/Various Side		10,882
Renewed Water Service Lines		10,419
Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant Filters No. 1-6 Stainless Steel Underdrains		10,356
Water Main Replacement - WD-2806 Vicente Street/19th to 25th Avenue		9,315
Water Main Replacement - WD-2718 Prospect/Fair/Coso Avenues/Coleridge Street		9,173
Contributed Capital - Yerba Buena Island 1.34 mg Prestressed Concrete Water Storage		8,770
Contributed Capital - Pier 70 Phase 1 Auxiliary Water Supply System Pipe Network		8,648
New Water Service Facilities		7,195
Auxiliary Water Supply System - Pipeline at Clarendon Avenue		6,871
Contributed Capital - Pier 70 Phase 1 Low Pressure Water Pipe Network		6,789
2023 March Emergency Major Road Repair - Cherry Lake Road		6,679
Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System - Pipeline at 19th Avenue		6,489
Other items individually below $5,000		72,425
Total	$	200,877

See Note 4 for additional information about Capital Assets.

(Continued)

Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)

The WSIP delivers capital improvements that enhance the Enterprise's ability to provide reliable, affordable, high-quality drinking water to its 27 wholesale customers and regional retail customers in Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties, as well as approximately 800,000 residential customers in San Francisco, in an environmentally sustainable manner. The program is structured to cost-effectively meet water quality requirements and long-term water supply objectives, as well as improve seismic and delivery reliability.

Overall, the $4.8 billion WSIP to upgrade the City of San Francisco's regional and local drinking water systems is 99% completed with $4.8 billion of project appropriations expended through fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. The program consists of 35 local projects located within San Francisco and 52 regional projects spread over seven different counties from the Sierra Foothills to San Francisco. As of June 30, 2024, 35 local projects were completed. For regional projects, 48 projects were completed, the Alameda Creek Recapture and Regional Groundwater Storage projects are under construction, the Bioregional Habitat Restoration project is in close-out, and Long-Term Mitigation Endowment project is not applicable as it does not include construction. The expected completion date is June 2032. Additional details regarding the WSIP are available at https://sfpuc.gov/construction-contracts/water-infrastructure-improvements.

Capital Assets, Fiscal Year 2023

The Enterprise has net capital assets of $5,652,952 invested in a broad range of utility capital assets as of June 30, 2023 (see Table 3). The investment in capital assets includes land, facilities, improvements, water treatment plants, aqueducts, water transmission, distribution mains, water storage facilities, pump stations, water reclamation facilities, machinery, and equipment. The Enterprise's net revenue and long-term debt are used to finance capital investments. Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization, increased by $30,969 from the prior year. Facilities, improvements, machinery, and equipment decreased by $51,080 mainly due to depreciation. Intangible assets decreased by $821 mainly due to amortization. Land decreased by $119 from the sale of Balboa Reservoir. Construction work in progress increased by $82,740 mainly from the Mountain Tunnel Improvement and SF Westside Recycled Water projects. Right-to-use lease and subscription assets increased by $249 due to the implementation of GASB Statement No. 96 – *SBITAs.*

Major additions to construction work in progress during the year ended June 30, 2023 include the following:

Mountain Tunnel Improvements	$	22,623
SF Westside Recycled Water Project		9,400
New Water Utility Service Facilities		7,594
Water Main Replacement and Auxiliary Water Supply System Pipeline - 19th Ave		7,183
College Hill Reservoir Outlet and Pipeline		7,087
Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Ozonation		6,987
Water Main Replacement - WD-2718 Prospect/Cortland/Fair Ave		5,987
Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant - Filters No. 1 to 6 Underdrain Replacement		5,939
Water Main Replacement - WD-2859 Taraval Segment B		5,649
San Joaquin Pipeline Valve and Safe Entry Improvements		5,486
Water Main Replacement - WD-2843 Diamond/27th/28th Streets		5,372
Water Main Replacement - WD-2806 Vicente Street/19th to 25th Ave		5,189
Regional Groundwater Storage and Recovery		5,152
Other project additions individually below $5,000		80,743
Total	$	180,391

(Continued)

Major land, depreciable facilities, improvements, intangible assets, machinery, and equipment placed in service, including transfers of completed projects from construction work in progress, during the year ended June 30, 2023 include the following:

Auxiliary Water Supply System Pumping Station No. 2 Improvement - Structural System	$	14,683
Water Main Replacement - WD-2811 17th/Clayton/Ord Streets		11,240
New Water Utility Service Facilities		7,594
Water Main Replacement - 19th Ave		7,018
Auxiliary Water Supply System Pumping Station No. 2 Improvement - Diesel Engine Generator		6,235
Other items individually below $5,000		54,730
Total	$	101,500

See Note 4 for additional information about Capital Assets.

Water System Improvement Program

The WSIP delivers capital improvements that enhance the Enterprise's ability to provide reliable, affordable, high-quality drinking water to its 27 wholesale customers and regional retail customers in Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties, as well as approximately 800,000 residential customers in San Francisco, in an environmentally sustainable manner. The program is structured to cost-effectively meet water quality requirements and long-term water supply objectives, as well as improve seismic and delivery reliability.

Overall, the $4.8 billion WSIP to upgrade the City of San Francisco's regional and local drinking water systems is 99% completed with $4.8 billion of project appropriations expended through fiscal year ended June 30, 2023. The program consists of 35 local projects located within San Francisco and 52 regional projects spread over seven different counties from the Sierra Foothills to San Francisco. As of June 30, 2023, 35 local projects were completed. For regional projects, 48 projects were completed, the Alameda Creek Recapture and Regional Groundwater Storage projects are under construction, the Bioregional Habitat Restoration project is in close-out, and Long-Term Mitigation Endowment project is not applicable as it does not include construction. The expected completion date is February 2027. Additional details regarding the WSIP are available at https://sfpuc.gov/construction-contracts/water-infrastructure-improvements.

Debt Administration

As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise had $5,503,839 total debt outstanding, an increase of $165,408 over the prior year, as shown below in Table 4. More detailed information about the Enterprise's debt activity is presented in Notes 6, 7, and 8 to the financial statements.

Table 4
Outstanding Debt, Net of Unamortized Costs
As of June 30, 2024, 2023, and 2022

	2024	2023	2022	2024-2023 Change	2023-2022 Change
Revenue bonds	$ 4,964,637	4,710,846	4,860,935	253,791	(150,089)
Commercial paper	190,000	371,459	206,297	(181,459)	165,162
Certificates of participation	89,232	92,499	95,637	(3,267)	(3,138)
State revolving fund loans	259,970	163,627	121,761	96,343	41,866
Total	$ 5,503,839	5,338,431	5,284,630	165,408	53,801

The increase of $253,791 in revenue bonds was due to increases of $928,890 in bond principal and $136,522 in bond premium from the issuances of 2023 Series AB revenue bonds and 2023 Series CD revenue refunding bonds, and $8 from the amortization of discount. These increases were offset by decreases of $619,115 in bond principal from refunding of various bonds by the 2023 Series CD revenue refund bonds, $135,075 in bond principal from repayment, $29,008 in premium from amortization, and $28,431 in bond premium from refunding. The Enterprise had $190,000 in tax-exempt commercial paper as of June 30, 2024, and $343,767 in tax-exempt and $27,692 in taxable commercial paper as of June 30, 2023. The $181,459 decrease of commercial paper resulted from a $372,609 decrease due to refunding by the 2023 Series AB revenue bonds, offset by a $190,995 increase in tax-exempt and $155 increase in taxable commercial paper from new issuances. The decrease of $3,267 in certificates of participation was from repayment. The $96,343 increase in SRF loans was from $97,477 in additional reimbursement requests submitted mainly for the Mountain Tunnel Improvement project offset by $1,134 in reversals of accrued interest capitalized to principal relating to the SF Westside Recycled Water project.

Credit Ratings and Bond Insurance – The Enterprise carried underlying ratings of "Aa2" and "AA-" from Moody's and S&P Global Ratings (S&P) on June 30, 2024, and "Aa2" and "AA-" from Moody's and S&P on June 30, 2023, respectively.

Debt Service Coverage – Pursuant to the Amended and Restated Indenture, the Enterprise is required to collect sufficient net revenues each fiscal year, together with any Enterprise funds (except Bond Reserve Funds), which are available for payment of debt service and are not budgeted to be expended, at least equal to 1.25 times annual debt service for said fiscal year, and for the SFPUC's debt service coverage policy, at least equal to 1.35 times annual debt service for said fiscal year. During fiscal years 2024 and 2023, the Enterprise's net revenues, together with fund balances available to pay debt service and not budgeted to be expended, were sufficient to meet the rate covenant requirements under the Enterprise's Amended and Restated Indenture and the SFPUC's debt service coverage policy (see Note 8).

Debt Authorization – Pursuant to the Charter Section 8B.124, the Enterprise can incur indebtedness upon two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, as approved by voters in Proposition E in November 2002. As of June 30, 2024, the Board of Supervisors has authorized the issuance of $6,157,510 in revenue bonds under Proposition E, with $4,317,653 issued against this authorization. The Enterprise can also incur indebtedness of up to $1,628,000 for improvements to the water system pursuant to Proposition A that

(Continued)

was approved by the voters in November 2002. As of June 30, 2024, $1,499,230 of the $1,628,000 Proposition A authorized bonds were issued. The Enterprise is also authorized to issue up to $500,000 in commercial paper.

Cost of Debt Capital – The Enterprise's outstanding long-term debt has coupon interest rates ranging from 0.7% to 7.0% as of June 30, 2024, and 0.3% to 7.0% as of June 30, 2023. The Enterprise's short-term debt has interest rates ranging from 2.2% to 5.2% during fiscal year 2024, and 1.2% to 5.3% during fiscal year 2023.

Rates and Charges

Rate Setting Process

Retail Customers

Proposition E, as approved by the voters in November 2002, amended the City Charter by adding the new Article VIIIB, entitled "Public Utilities," which changed the Commission's ability to issue new revenue bonds and set retail water rates. For the retail water rate setting, the Commission is required to:

- Establish rates, fees, and charges based on cost of service;
- Retain an independent rate consultant to conduct cost of service studies at least every five years;
- Consider establishing new connection fees;
- Consider conservation incentives and lifeline rates;
- Adopt a rolling five-year forecast annually; and
- Establish a Rate Fairness Board.

Pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco Charter Section 8B.125, an independent rate study is performed at least once every five years. In compliance with City Charter section 8B.125, a rate study was completed in spring 2023. In May 2023, the Commission subsequently adopted three years of retail rate increases from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2026.

Other miscellaneous fees for service and charges were last approved in April 2024 to be effective July 1, 2024, and generally increase annually by the Consumer Price Index from the Controller's Office of the City and County of San Francisco, or the 20-City Average Construction Index (CCI) published by Engineering News-Record (ENR) Magazine.

All current SFPUC Rates Schedules and Fees are available at https://sfpuc.gov/accounts-services/water-power-and-sewer-rates.

Wholesale Customers

The Water Supply Agreement (WSA) prescribes the rate setting process for the wholesale water rates. The WSA has a 25-year term, beginning on July 1, 2009, with two 5-year extension options, and was most recently amended and restated in January 2023. Compared to the prior contract with the wholesale customers, the WSA changed the rate basis by which the capital cost recovery is determined from a "utility basis" to a "cash basis," resulting in the repayment of the cost of capital over the life of the debt funding of those assets or at the time of budget appropriation and spending for revenue-funded capital projects, rather than the life of the asset. The WSA requires the rate be calculated and set annually and includes a reconciliation between prior year revenues and expenses. Refer to Note 11 of the notes to financial statements for further discussion on the balancing account of the wholesale customers.

The following table is the Enterprise's ten-year average percent rate adjustments:

Ten-year Average Rate Adjustments

Effective Date:	Retail	Wholesale [5]
July 1, 2016	10.0 [1]	9.3
July 1, 2017	7.0 [1]	-
July 1, 2018	9.0 [2]	-
July 1, 2019	8.0 [2]	-
July 1, 2020	7.0 [2]	-
July 1, 2021	7.0 [2]	-
July 1, 2022	- [3]	15.9
July 1, 2023	5.0 [4]	9.7
July 1, 2024	5.0 [4]	8.8
July 1, 2025	5.0 [4]	-

[1] Four-year retail rate increases adopted and effective July 1, 2014.
[2] Four-year retail rate increases adopted and effective July 1, 2018.
[3] No retail rate increase adopted and effective July 1, 2022.
[4] Three-year rate increases adopted and effective July 1, 2023.
[5] Wholesale rates adopted annually.

Request for Information

This report is designed to provide our citizens, customers, investors, and creditors with an overview of the Enterprise's finances and to demonstrate the Enterprise's accountability for the money it receives. Questions regarding any of the information provided in this report or requests for additional financial information should be addressed to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Chief Financial Officer, 525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102. This report is available at https://sfpuc.gov/about-us/reports/audited-financial-statements-reports.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE
Statements of Net Position
June 30, 2024 and 2023
(In thousands)

	2024	2023
Assets		
Current assets:		
Cash and investments with City Treasury	$ 380,201	402,885
Cash and investments outside City Treasury	193	192
Receivables:		
Charges for services, current portion (net of allowance for doubtful accounts of $10,777 as of June 30, 2024 and $8,615 as of June 30, 2023)	79,483	63,943
Wholesale balancing account receivable, current portion	26,121	5,571
Due from other City departments	102	115
Due from other governments	366	—
Interest	3,861	2,621
Interest - Leases	935	911
Restricted due from other governments	129,580	36,147
Leases receivable, current portion	3,246	3,521
Restricted interest and other receivable (net of allowance for doubtful accounts of $131 as of June 30, 2024 and $30 as of June 30, 2023)	3,789	3,510
Total current receivables	247,483	116,339
Prepaid charges, advances, and other receivables, current portion	4,958	5,909
Inventory	7,825	8,191
Restricted cash and investments outside City Treasury, current portion	40,065	10,863
Total current assets	680,725	544,379
Non-current assets:		
Wholesale balancing account receivable, less current portion	—	4,481
Restricted cash and investments with City Treasury	71,015	21,000
Restricted cash and investments outside City Treasury, less current portion	63,185	66,482
Leases receivable, less current portion	35,817	40,109
Restricted interest and other receivable (net of allowance for doubtful accounts of $0 as of June 30, 2024 and $8 as of June 30, 2023)	—	4
Charges for services, less current portion (net of allowance for doubtful accounts of $664 as of June 30, 2024 and $656 as of June 30, 2023)	200	209
Note receivable - Balboa Reservoir	11,512	11,007
Right-to-use lease asset, net of accumulated amortization	2,734	3,943
Right-to-use subscription asset, net of accumulated amortization	311	695
Capital assets, not being depreciated and amortized	720,805	640,995
Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization	5,054,617	5,007,319
Prepaid charges, advances, and other receivables, less current portion	3,236	3,406
Total non-current assets	5,963,432	5,799,650
Total assets	6,644,157	6,344,029
Deferred outflows of resources		
Unamortized loss on refunding of debt	89,186	124,635
Pensions	93,526	70,101
Other postemployment benefits	29,974	28,616
Total deferred outflows of resources	$ 212,686	223,352

(Continued)

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE
Statements of Net Position
June 30, 2024 and 2023
(In thousands)

	2024	2023
Liabilities		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable	$ 25,353	22,671
Accrued payroll	13,444	11,807
Accrued vacation and sick leave, current portion	7,585	7,057
Accrued workers' compensation, current portion	2,188	1,914
Due to other City departments	—	2,440
Damage claims liability, current portion	5,716	11,125
Unearned revenues, refunds, and other	15,050	13,977
Bond, loan, lease, and subscription interest payable, current portion	37,924	35,104
Lease liability, current portion	1,028	1,189
Subscription liability, current portion	153	400
Revenue bonds, current portion	138,140	135,095
Certificates of participation, current portion	3,402	3,267
Commercial paper, current portion	190,000	—
Current liabilities payable from restricted assets	39,896	40,863
Total current liabilities	479,879	286,909
Long-term liabilities:		
Arbitrage rebate payable	869	—
Net other postemployment benefits liability	158,301	148,601
Net pension liability	152,643	115,343
Lease liability, less current portion	1,793	2,821
Subscription liability, less current portion	155	308
Accrued vacation and sick leave, less current portion	6,418	6,528
Accrued workers' compensation, less current portion	8,814	7,821
Damage claims liability, less current portion	17,057	8,500
Bond, loan, lease, and subscription interest payable, less current portion	3,622	—
Revenue bonds, less current portion	4,826,497	4,575,751
Certificates of participation, less current portion	85,830	89,232
Commercial paper, less current portion	—	371,459
State revolving fund loans	259,970	163,627
Pollution remediation obligation	1,271	1,271
Total long-term liabilities	5,523,240	5,491,262
Total liabilities	6,003,119	5,778,171
Deferred inflows of resources		
Unamortized gain on refunding of debt	31,854	—
Pensions	13,305	28,504
Leases	36,583	41,558
Other postemployment benefits	22,334	27,075
Total deferred inflows of resources	104,076	97,137
Net position		
Net investment in capital assets	350,430	460,213
Restricted for debt service	44,724	14,625
Restricted for capital projects	200,632	56,822
Unrestricted	153,862	160,413
Total net position	$ 749,648	692,073

See accompanying notes to financial statements

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE

Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position
Years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023
(In thousands)

	2024	2023
Operating revenues:		
Charges for services	$ 650,233	661,241
Rents and concessions	8,556	13,282
Capacity fees	863	1,256
Other revenues	17,238	15,312
Total operating revenues	676,890	691,091
Operating expenses:		
Personnel services	159,779	135,709
Contractual services	20,128	16,919
Materials and supplies	23,195	20,046
Depreciation and amortization	155,172	155,714
Services provided by other departments	77,638	79,910
General and administrative and other	93,444	51,955
Total operating expenses	529,356	460,253
Operating income	147,534	230,838
Non-operating revenues (expenses):		
Federal and state grants	12,414	—
Interest and investment income	25,097	11,156
Interest expenses	(222,055)	(214,913)
Amortization of premium, discount, refunding loss, and issuance costs	13,825	9,971
Net gain from sale of assets	2,060	12,660
Other non-operating revenues	27,597	28,019
Other non-operating expenses	(1,760)	(1,775)
Net non-operating expenses	(142,822)	(154,882)
Change in net position before capital contributions and transfers	4,712	75,956
Capital contributions	53,599	2,717
Transfers from the City and County of San Francisco	505	5
Transfers to the City and County of San Francisco	(1,241)	(20,032)
Capital contributions and net transfers	52,863	(17,310)
Change in net position	57,575	58,646
Net position at beginning of year	692,073	633,427
Net position at end of year	$ 749,648	692,073

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE
Statements of Cash Flows
Years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023
(In thousands)

	2024	2023
Cash flows from operating activities:		
Cash received from customers, including cash deposits	$ 636,706	582,603
Cash received from tenants for rent	8,343	13,098
Cash received from miscellaneous revenues	4,776	4,832
Cash paid to employees for services	(151,655)	(142,866)
Cash paid to suppliers for goods and services	(194,099)	(174,938)
Cash paid for judgments and claims	(18,216)	(6,927)
Net cash provided by operating activities	285,855	275,802
Cash flows from non-capital financing activities:		
Cash received from grants	13,400	—
Cash received from settlements	—	6,750
Cash paid for rebates and program incentives	(1,760)	(1,775)
Transfers from the City and County of San Francisco	505	5
Transfers to the City and County of San Francisco	(1,241)	(20,032)
Net cash provided by (used in) non-capital financing activities	10,904	(15,052)
Cash flows from capital and related financing activities:		
Proceeds from sale of capital assets	1,569	1,370
Proceeds from bond issuance, net of premium	474,538	—
Proceeds from commercial paper borrowings	191,150	165,162
Proceeds from State revolving fund loan	4,044	12,371
Principal paid on commercial paper	(372,609)	—
Principal paid on long-term debt	(138,342)	(128,408)
Interest paid on long-term debt	(214,366)	(209,194)
Interest paid on commercial paper	(1,511)	(5,170)
Issuance cost paid on long-term debt	(4,545)	—
Lease payment	(1,270)	(1,050)
Subscription payment	(408)	(862)
Acquisition and construction of capital assets	(228,113)	(172,835)
Federal interest income subsidy from Build America Bonds	22,909	23,260
Net cash (used in) capital and related financing activities	(266,954)	(315,356)
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Interest income received	17,141	9,141
Proceeds from sale of investments outside City Treasury	1,015,279	348,315
Purchase of investments outside City Treasury	(1,081,634)	(348,315)
Net cash (used in) provided by investing activities	(49,214)	9,141
Decrease in cash and cash equivalents	(19,409)	(45,465)
Cash and cash equivalents:		
Beginning of year	514,901	560,366
End of year	495,492	514,901
Reconciliation of cash and cash equivalents to the statement of net position:		
Cash and investments with City Treasury:		
Unrestricted	380,201	402,885
Restricted	71,015	21,000
Add: Unrealized loss on investments with City Treasury	7,188	13,479
Cash and investments outside City Treasury:		
Unrestricted	193	192
Restricted	103,250	77,345
Less: Unrealized (gain) loss on investments outside City Treasury	(540)	—
Less: Restricted (with maturity more than 90 days - see table in Note 3)	(65,815)	—
Cash and cash equivalents at end of year on statements of cash flows	$ 495,492	514,901

(Continued)

SAN FRANCISCO WATER ENTERPRISE
Statements of Cash Flows
Years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023
(In thousands)

	2024	2023
Reconciliation of operating income to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Operating income	$ 147,534	230,838
Adjustments to reconcile operating income to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization	155,172	155,714
Miscellaneous revenue	4,776	4,832
Provision for uncollectible accounts	2,263	4,584
Write-off of capital assets and other non-cash items	58	4,628
Changes in operating assets and liabilities:		
Receivables:		
Charges for services	(17,701)	(13,655)
Prepaid charges, advances, and other	560	6,709
Due from other City departments	13	63
Inventory	366	(1,389)
Leases	(327)	575
Subscriptions	8	895
Accounts payable	2,682	(181)
Accrued payroll	1,637	1,312
Net other postemployment benefits obligation*	3,601	10,042
Net pension obligations*	(1,324)	(21,699)
Accrued vacation and sick leave	418	(144)
Accrued workers' compensation	1,267	762
Due to other City departments	(2,440)	2,440
Wholesale balancing account	(16,069)	(89,202)
Damage claims liability	3,148	(16,444)
Unearned revenues, refunds, and other liabilities	213	(4,878)
Total adjustments	138,321	44,964
Net cash provided by operating activities	$ 285,855	275,802
Noncash transactions:		
Accrued capital asset costs	$ 39,896	40,863
Interfund payable	—	2,440
Unrealized loss on investments with City Treasury	7,188	13,479
Unrealized (gain) on investments outside City Treasury	(540)	—
Capital contribution	53,599	2,717
Sale of land with promissory note	11,512	11,007
Principal refunded	619,115	—
Bond proceeds paid to refunding escrow	590,874	—

* Net other postemployment benefits obligation include related deferred outflows/inflows

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

(1) Description of Reporting Entity

The San Francisco Water Enterprise (the Enterprise) was established in 1930 under the provisions of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (the City). The Enterprise acquired the fully developed, mature water works for San Francisco on March 3, 1930. Since then, the City has operated and maintained the water works as the San Francisco Water Enterprise. The Board of Supervisors of the City has adopted resolutions (the Water Resolutions) providing for the issuance of various water revenue and refunding bond series. The Water Resolutions require the City to keep separate books of records and accounts of the Enterprise. The Enterprise, which consists of a system of reservoirs, storage tanks, water treatment plants, pump stations, and pipelines, is engaged in the distribution of water to San Francisco and certain suburban areas. In fiscal year 2024, the Enterprise sold approximately 63,854 million gallons, i.e., about 174 million gallons per day of water, to approximately 2.7 million people within San Francisco and certain suburban areas.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC or the Commission), established in 1932, is responsible for providing operational oversight of the public utility enterprises of the City, which include the Enterprise along with the City's power and sewer utilities (i.e., Hetch Hetchy Water and Power and CleanPowerSF, of which the Power Enterprise is a component, and the San Francisco Wastewater Enterprise). The Commission is responsible for determining such matters as the rates and charges for services, approval of contracts, and organizational policy.

The City Charter was amended in 2008 by Proposition E, a City and County of San Francisco Charter Section 4.112 amendment approved by the voters in the June 3, 2008 election, terminated the terms of all five existing members of the SFPUC, changed the process for appointing new members, and set qualifications for all members. Under the amended Charter, the Mayor continues to nominate candidates to the SFPUC, but nominees do not take office until the Board of Supervisors votes to approve their appointments by a majority (at least six members). The amended Charter provides for staggered four year terms for SFPUC members and requires them to meet the following qualifications:

- Seat 1 must have experience in environmental policy and an understanding of environmental justice issues.
- Seat 2 must have experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy.
- Seat 3 must have experience in project finance.
- Seat 4 must have experience in water systems, power systems, or public utility management.
- Seat 5 is an at-large member.

The SFPUC is a department of the City, and as such, the financial operations of the Enterprise, Hetch Hetchy Water and Power and CleanPowerSF, and the Wastewater Enterprises are included in the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report of the City as enterprise funds. These financial statements are intended to present only the financial position, and the changes in financial position and cash flows of only that portion of the City that is attributable to the transactions of the Enterprise. They do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the City as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the changes in its financial position, or, where applicable, the cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

(Continued)

(2) Significant Accounting Policies

(a) Basis of Accounting and Measurement Focus

The accounts of the Enterprise are organized on the basis of a proprietary fund type and are included as an enterprise fund of the City. The activities of this Enterprise are accounted for with a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise the Enterprise's assets, deferred outflows, liabilities, deferred inflows, net position, revenues, and expenses. Enterprise funds account for activities (i) that are financed with debt that is secured solely by a pledge of the net revenues from fees and charges of the activity; or (ii) that are required by laws or regulations that the activity's costs of providing services, including capital costs (such as depreciation or debt service), be recovered with fees and charges, rather than with taxes or similar revenues; or (iii) that the pricing policies of the activity establish fees and charges designed to recover its costs, including capital costs (such as depreciation or debt service).

The financial activities of the Enterprise are accounted for on a flow of economic resources measurement focus, using the accrual basis of accounting in accordance with U.S. GAAP. Under this method, all assets and liabilities associated with its operations are included on the statement of net position; revenues are recognized when earned, and expenses are recognized when liabilities are incurred. Operating revenues are defined as charges to customers, rental income, and capacity fees. Non-operating revenues include grants, investment income, and other income from non-operating activities.

The Enterprise applies all applicable Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncements.

(b) Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Enterprise considers its pooled cash and investments held with the City Treasury to be demand deposits and, therefore, cash and cash equivalents for financial reporting. The City Treasury also holds non-pooled cash and investments for the Enterprise. Non-pooled restricted deposits and investments held outside the City Treasury with original maturities of three months or less are also considered to be cash equivalents.

(c) Investments

Money market funds are carried at cost, which approximates fair value. All other investments are stated at fair value based on quoted market prices. Changes in fair value are recognized as investment gains or losses and are recorded as a component of non-operating revenues.

(d) Inventory

Inventory consists primarily of construction materials and maintenance supplies and is valued at average cost. Inventory is expensed as it is consumed.

(e) Capital Assets

Capital assets are defined as assets with an initial individual cost of more than $5 and an estimated useful life in excess of one year. Capital assets with an original acquisition date prior to July 1, 1977 are recorded in the financial statements at estimated cost, as determined by an independent professional appraisal, or at cost, if known. All subsequent acquisitions have been recorded at cost. All donated capital assets at the time of donation and capital assets received

(Continued)

in a service concession arrangement, are valued at acquisition value. Depreciation and amortization are computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the related assets, which range from 1 to 100 years for equipment and 1 to 200 years for buildings, structures, and improvements. No depreciation or amortization is recorded in the year of acquisition, and depreciation or amortization is recorded in the year of disposal.

(f) Intangible Assets

Intangible assets are defined as identifiable, non-financial assets capable of being separated, sold, transferred, or licensed, and include contractual or legal rights. Examples of intangible assets include rights-of-way easements, land use rights, water rights, licenses, permits, leases, and subscription–based information technology arrangements (SBITAs). The Enterprise capitalizes purchased or internally developed intangible assets with a useful life extending beyond one reporting period. It has established a capitalization threshold of $100. Intangible assets are amortized over the benefit period or the contract term for leases and SBITAs, except for certain assets having an indefinite useful life. Assets with an indefinite useful life generally provide a benefit that is not constrained by legal or contractual limitations or any other external factor and, therefore, are not amortized (see Note 4).

(g) Construction Work in Progress

The cost of acquisition and construction of major plant and equipment is recorded as construction work in progress. Costs of discontinued construction projects are recorded as an expense in the year in which the decision is made to discontinue such projects.

(h) Bond Discount, Premium, and Issuance Costs

Bond issuance costs related to prepaid insurance costs are capitalized and amortized using the effective interest method. Other bond issuance costs are expensed when incurred. Original issue bond discount or premium is offset against the related debt and is also amortized using the effective interest method.

(i) Accrued Vacation and Sick Leave

Accrued vacation pay, which may be accumulated up to 10 weeks per employee, is charged to expense as earned. Sick leave earned subsequent to December 6, 1978 is non-vesting and may be accumulated up to six months per employee.

(j) Workers' Compensation

The Enterprise is self-insured for workers' compensation claims and accrues the estimated cost of those claims, including the estimated cost of incurred but not reported claims (see Note 14(b)).

(k) General Liability

The Enterprise is self-insured for general liability and uninsurable property damage claims. Commercially uninsurable property includes assets that are underground or provide transmission and distribution. Maintained commercial coverage does not cover claims attributed to loss from earthquake, contamination, pollution remediation efforts, and other specific naturally occurring contaminants such as mold. The liability represents an estimate of

the cost of all outstanding claims, including adverse loss development and estimated incurred but not reported claims (see Note 14(a)).

(l) Arbitrage Rebate Payable

Certain bonds are subject to arbitrage rebate requirements in accordance with regulations issued by the U.S. Treasury Department. The requirements generally stipulate that earnings from the investment of the tax-exempt bond proceeds that exceed related interest costs on the bonds must be remitted to the federal government on every fifth anniversary of each bond issue. The arbitrage rebate liability as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 were $869 and $0, respectively.

(m) Refunding of Debt

Gains or losses occurring from refunding of debt prior to maturity are reported as deferred outflows and deferred inflows of resources from refunding of debt. Deferred outflows and deferred inflows of resources are recognized as a component of interest expense using the effective interest method over the remaining life of the old debt or the life of the new debt, whichever is shorter.

(n) Income Taxes

As a department of a government agency, the Enterprise is exempt from both federal income taxes and California state franchise taxes.

(o) Revenue Recognition

Water service charges are based on water usage as determined by the Enterprise. Effective July 2013, the majority of residential and non-residential customers are billed on a monthly basis except for building and contractor customers, which are billed on a bi-monthly basis. Revenues earned but unbilled are accrued as charges for services and reflected as a receivable on the statements of net position. The unbilled amounts as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 were $44,465 and $31,704, respectively.

(p) Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, deferred outflows and deferred inflows, and the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

(q) Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pollution Remediation Obligations

According to GASB Statement No. 49, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pollution Remediation Obligations*, a government would have to estimate its expected outlays for pollution remediation if it knows a site is polluted, and any of the following recognition triggers occur:

- Pollution poses an imminent danger to the public or environment and a government has little or no discretion to avoid fixing the problem;
- A government has violated a pollution prevention-related permit or license;

- A regulator has identified (or evidence indicates it will identify) a government as responsible (or potentially responsible) for cleaning up pollution, or for paying all or some of the cost of the cleanup;
- A government is named (or evidence indicates that it will be named) in a lawsuit to compel it to address the pollution; or
- A government begins or legally obligates itself to begin cleanup or post-cleanup activities (limited to amounts the government is legally required to complete).

As a part of ongoing operations, situations may occur requiring the removal of pollution or other hazardous material. These situations typically arise in the process of acquiring an asset, preparing an asset for its intended use, or during the design phase of projects under review by the project managers. Other times, pollution may arise during the implementation and construction of a major or minor capital project. Examples of pollution may include, but are not limited to: asbestos or lead paint removal, leaking of sewage in underground pipes or neighboring areas, chemical spills, removal and disposal of known toxic waste, harmful biological and chemical pollution of water, or contamination of surrounding soils by underground storage tanks (see Note 15(d)).

(r) Leases

Leases are defined as a contract that conveys control of the right to use another entity's underlying asset for a specified period. The Enterprise is a lessee and lessor for various noncancellable leases of land, building, equipment, vehicles, easement, etc.

Short-term Leases

For leases with a maximum possible term of 12 months or less at commencement, the Enterprise recognizes lease revenue if the Enterprise executes a lessor lease or lease expense if the Enterprise executes a lessee lease based on the provisions of the lease contract. Liabilities are only recognized if payments are received in advance, and receivables are only recognized if payments are received subsequent to the reporting period.

Leases Other Than Short-term

For all other leases (i.e. those that are not short-term), the Enterprise recognizes a lease liability and intangible right-to-use lease asset for the Enterprise as lessee leases, or lease receivable and deferred inflow of resources for the Enterprise as lessor leases.

Measurement of Lease Amounts (Lessee)

The Enterprise's lease liability is recorded at the present value of future minimum lease payments as of the date of commencement. Subsequently, the lease liability is reduced by the principal portion of lease payments made. The lease asset is initially measured as the initial amount of the lease liability, less lease payments made at or before the lease commencement date, plus any initial direct costs ancillary to placing the underlying asset into service, less any lease incentives received at or before the lease commencement date. Subsequently, the lease asset is amortized into depreciation and amortization expense on a straight-line basis over the lease term. If the Enterprise is reasonably certain of exercising a purchase option contained in a lease, the lease asset will be amortized over the useful life of the underlying asset.

Measurement of Lease Amounts (Lessor)

The Enterprise's lease receivable is measured at the present value of payments expected to be received during the lease term, reduced by any provision of estimated uncollectible amounts. Subsequently, the lease receivable is reduced by the principal portion of lease payments collected. The deferred inflow of resources is initially measured as the initial amount of the lease receivable, less any lease incentives paid to, or on behalf of, the lessee at or before the commencement of the lease term, plus lease payments received from the lease at or before the commencement of the lease term that related to future periods. Subsequently, the deferred inflow of resources as lease revenue is on a straight-line basis over the lease term.

Key Estimates and Judgments

Key estimates and judgments include how the Enterprise determines (a) the discount rate it uses to calculate the present value of the expected lease payments, (b) lease terms, (c) lease payments, and (d) materiality threshold for equipment.

- The Enterprise generally uses its estimated incremental borrowing rate as the discount rate for leases unless the rate is implicit in the lease. The City's incremental borrowing rate (IBR) is established using the average of Municipal Market Data (MMD) AAA benchmark interest rate index by maturity date (year 1 to 30+), plus the average credit spread based on City's Aa/AA, COP, Tax-exempt to generate the yield curve and discount rate table. The City's incremental borrowing rate for leases is based on the rate of interest it would need to pay if it issued general obligation bonds to borrow an amount equal to the lease payments under similar terms at the commencement or remeasurement date.

- The lease term includes the noncancellable period of the lease, plus any additional periods covered by either lessee or lessor unilateral option to (1) extend for which it is reasonably certain to be exercised, or (2) terminate for which it is reasonably certain not to be exercised. Periods in which both the lessee and lessor have an option to terminate (or if both parties have to agree to extend) are excluded from the lease term.

- Payments are evaluated by the Enterprise to determine if they should be included in the measurement of the lease receivables or lease liabilities, including those payments that require a determination of whether they are reasonably certain of being made, such as residual value guarantees, purchase options, payments for termination penalties, and other payments.

- Equipment and other leases have a capitalization threshold of $100. 70% below market rent and/or ground leases are determined to be below market rent (BMR) and are excluded from lease capitalization.

Remeasurement of Lease

The Enterprise monitors changes in circumstances that may require remeasurement of a lease. When certain changes occur that are expected to significantly affect the amount of the lease receivable or lease liability, the receivable or liability is remeasured and a corresponding adjustment is made to the deferred inflow of resources or lease asset, respectively.

(Continued)

Presentation in Statement of Net Position

Lease assets are reported with current and non-current assets, lease liabilities are reported with current and long-term liabilities, and both capital-related assets and liabilities are reported under net investment in capital assets in the statement of net position (see Note 9).

(s) Subscription-Based Information Technology Arrangements

Subscription–Based Information Technology Arrangements (SBITAs) are defined as a contract that conveys control of the right to use another entity's IT software, alone or in combination with tangible capital assets for a specified period. The Enterprise has noncancellable subscription arrangements (similar to a lease) for the right to use various information technology hardware and software SBITAs.

Short-term SBITAs

For SBITAs with a maximum possible term of 12 months or less at commencement, the Enterprise recognizes subscription expense based on the provisions of the SBITAs. Liabilities are only recognized if payments are received in advance, and receivables are only recognized if payments are received subsequent to the reporting period.

SBITAs Other Than Short-term

For all other SBITAs (i.e., those that are not short-term) the Enterprise recognizes SBITAs liability and intangible right-to-use subscription asset for the Enterprise.

Measurement of Subscription Amounts (Subscriber)

The Enterprise's subscription liability is recorded at the present value of future minimum subscription payments as of the date of commencement. Subsequently, the subscription liability is reduced by the principal portion of subscription payments made. The subscription asset is initially measured as the initial amount of the subscription liability, less payments made at or before the subscription commencement date, plus any initial direct costs ancillary to placing the underlying asset into service, less any subscription incentives received at or before the subscription commencement date. For SBITAs, subscription assets also include qualified software implementation costs. Subsequently, the subscription asset is amortized into depreciation and amortization expense on a straight-line basis over the subscription term.

Key Estimates and Judgments

Key estimates and judgments include how the Enterprise determines (a) the discount rate it uses to calculate the present value of the expected subscription payments, (b) subscription terms, (c) subscription payments, and (d) materiality threshold.

• The Enterprise generally uses its estimated incremental borrowing rate as the discount rate for SBITAs unless the rate is implicit in the agreement. The Enterprise incremental borrowing rate (IBR) is established using the average of Municipal Market Data (MMD) AAA benchmark interest rate index by maturity date (year 1 to 30+), plus the average credit spread based on Enterprise's Aa/AA, COP, Tax-exempt to generate the yield curve and discount rate table.

• The subscription term includes the noncancellable period of the subscription, plus any additional periods covered by either subscriber or lessor unilateral option to (1) extend for which

it is reasonably certain to be exercised, or (2) terminate for which it is reasonably certain not to be exercised. Periods in which both the subscriber and lessor have an option to terminate (or if both parties have to agree to extend) are excluded from the subscription term.

• Payments are evaluated by Enterprise to determine if they should be included in the measurement of the subscription liabilities, including those payments that require a determination of whether they are reasonably certain of being made, such as residual value guarantees, purchase options, payments for termination penalties, and other payments.

• SBITAs have a capitalization threshold of $100.

Remeasurement of Lease or SBITAs

The Enterprise monitors changes in circumstances that may require remeasurement of SBITAs. When certain changes occur that are expected to significantly affect the amount of the subscription liability, the liability is remeasured, and a corresponding adjustment is made to the subscription asset.

Presentation in Statement of Net Position

Subscription assets are reported with current and non-current assets, subscription liabilities are reported with short-term and long-term liabilities, and both subscription assets and liabilities are reported under net investment in capital assets in the statement of net position (see Note 10).

(t) Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB)

Net OPEB liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to OPEB, and OPEB expense are actuarially determined on a citywide basis. Net OPEB liability is measured as the portion of the present value of projected benefit payments to be provided to current active and inactive employees attributed to those employees' past service, less the amount of the Retiree Healthcare Trust Fund investments measured at fair value (see Note 12(b)).

(u) New Accounting Standards Adopted in Fiscal Year 2024

1) In April 2022, the GASB issued Statement No. 99, *Omnibus 2022*. GASB Statement No. 99 addresses a variety of topics. The requirements related to extension of the use of the London Interbank Offered Rate, accounting for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program distributions, disclosures of nonmonetary transactions, pledges of future revenues by pledging governments, clarification of certain provisions in Statement No. 34, and terminology updates related to Statement No. 53 and Statement No. 63 were adopted by the Enterprise for the year ended June 30, 2022. The requirements related to financial guarantees and the classification and reporting of derivative instruments within the scope of Statement No. 53 are effective for fiscal years beginning after June 15, 2023. The Enterprise adopted the provisions of Statement No. 99 in fiscal year 2024 which did not have a significant effect on its financial statements.

2) In June 2022, the GASB issued Statement No. 100, *Accounting Changes and Error Corrections*. This statement enhances accounting and financial reporting requirements for accounting changes and error corrections to provide more understandable, reliable, relevant, consistent, and comparable information for making decisions or assessing accountability. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 2023. The

Enterprise adopted the provisions of Statement No. 100 in fiscal year 2024 which did not have a significant effect on its financial statements.

(v) GASB Statements Implemented in Fiscal Year 2023

1) In May 2019, the GASB issued Statement No. 91, *Conduit Debt Obligations*. GASB Statement No. 91 enhances the comparability and consistency of conduit debt obligation reporting and reporting of related transactions by State and local government issuers. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after December 15, 2021. The Enterprise adopted the provisions of Statement No. 91 in fiscal year 2023 which did not have a significant effect on its financial statements.

2) In March 2020, the GASB Issued Statement No. 94, *Public-Private and Public-Public Partnerships and Availability Payment Arrangements*. The primary objective of this statement is to improve financial reporting by addressing issues related to public-private and public-public partnership arrangements and availability payment arrangements (PPPs). The Enterprise adopted the provisions of Statement No. 94 in fiscal year 2023 which did not have a significant effect on its financial statements.

3) In May 2020, the GASB issued Statement No. 96, *Subscription-Based Information Technology Arrangements (SBITAs)*. This statement defines such arrangements as contracts that convey control of the right to use another party's information technology software, alone or in combination with tangible capital assets, as specified in the contract for a period of time in an exchange or exchange-like transaction. The standard clarifies measurement and recognition of capitalizable costs, intangible assets, and subscription liabilities for such arrangements and also requires additional disclosures related to such arrangements. The standard is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 2022. The Enterprise adopted the provisions of Statement No. 96 in fiscal year 2023 (see Note 10).

(w) Future Implementation of New Accounting Standards

1) In June 2022, the GASB issued Statement No. 101, *Compensated Absences*. This statement is to better meet the information needs of financial statement users by updating the recognition and measurement guidance for compensated absences. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after December 15, 2023. The Enterprise will implement the provisions of Statement No. 101 in fiscal year 2025.

2) In December 2023, the GASB issued Statement No. 102, *Certain Risk Disclosures*. This statement establishes financial reporting requirements for risks related to vulnerabilities due to certain concentrations or constraints within governments. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after December 15, 2023. The Enterprise will implement the provisions of Statement No. 102 in fiscal year 2025.

3) In April 2024, the GASB issued Statement No. 103, *Financial Reporting Model Improvements*. This statement is to improve key components of the financial reporting model to enhance its effectiveness in providing information that is essential for decision making and assessing a government's accountability. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 2025. The Enterprise will implement the provisions of Statement No. 103 in fiscal year 2026.

(Continued)

4) In September 2024, the GASB issued Statement No. 104, *Disclosure of Certain Capital Assets*. This statement requires certain types of capital assets, such as lease assets recognized in accordance with Statement No. 87, *Leases*, and intangible right-to-use assets recognized in accordance with Statement No. 94, *Public-Private and Public-Public Partnerships and Availability Payment Arrangements* to be disclosed separately by major classes of underlying assets in the capital assets note disclosures. Subscription assets recognized in accordance with Statement No. 96, *Subscription-Based Information Technology Arrangements* are also required to be disclosed separately. Furthermore, the statement requires intangible assets other than those three types to be disclosed separately by major class. Finally, the statement requires additional disclosures for capital assets held for sale. The new standard is effective for periods beginning after June 15, 2025. The Enterprise will implement the provisions of Statement No. 104 in fiscal year 2026.

(x) Reclassifications

The Enterprise has reclassified certain amounts relating to the prior period to conform to its current period presentation. Lease receivable, lease related interest receivable, lease related interest payable, and subscription related interest payable were reclassified from net investment in capital assets to unrestricted in the statement of net position for fiscal year 2023. Restricted liabilities were reclassified from net position restricted for capital projects to net investment in capital assets for fiscal years 2024 and 2023. These reclassifications had no effect on previously reported changes in net position.

(3) Cash, Cash Equivalents, and Investments

The Enterprise's cash, cash equivalents, and investments with the City Treasury are invested in an unrated City pool pursuant to investment policy guidelines established by the City Treasurer. The objectives of the policy guidelines are, in order of priority, preservation of capital, liquidity, and yield. The policy addresses soundness of financial institutions in which the City will deposit funds, types of investment instruments as permitted by the California Government Code, and the percentage of the portfolio that may be invested in certain instruments with longer terms to maturity. The City Treasurer allocates income from the investment of pooled cash at month-end in proportion to the Enterprise's average daily cash balances. The primary objectives of the Enterprise's investment policy are consistent with the City's policy.

Some restricted assets are held by an independent trustee outside the City's investment pool. The assets are held for the purpose of paying future interest and principal on the bonds and for eligible capital project expenditures. The current balances as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 were $103,250 and $77,345, respectively. The Enterprise held all investments in treasury and government obligations, commercial paper, as well as money market mutual funds consisting of treasury and government obligations.

Funds held by the trustee established under the 2002 Amended and Restated Indentures agreements are invested in "Permitted Investments," as defined in the agreement, which includes money market funds and investment agreements. The agreement permits investment in money market funds registered under the Federal Investment Company Act of 1940 whose shares are registered under the Federal Securities Act of 1933 and have a rating by S&P of "AAAm-G," "AAAm," or "Aam," and a rating by Moody's of "Aaa," "Aa1," or "Aa2". The credit ratings of the money market funds invested in as of June 30, 2024 were "Aaa-mf" and "P-1" by Moody's, and "AAAm" and "A-1" by S&P. The credit ratings of the money market funds invested in as of June 30, 2023 were "Aaa-mf"

(Continued)

and "P-1" by Moody's, and "AAAm" and "A-1" by S&P. Investment agreements must be with a U.S. bank or trust company that have a rating by Moody's and S&P of "A" or higher, or are guaranteed by any entity with a rating of "A" or higher, at the time the agreement is entered.

The Enterprise categorizes its fair value measurements within the fair value hierarchy established by GAAP. The hierarchy is based on the valuation inputs used to measure fair value of the assets. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices in active markets for identical assets; Level 2 inputs are significant other observable inputs; and Level 3 inputs are significant unobservable inputs. The inputs and techniques used for valuing securities are not necessarily an indication of risk associated with investing in those securities.

The following tables present the restricted and unrestricted cash and investments outside City Treasury, including commercial paper issuers, credit ratings and the fair value hierarchy as of June 30, 2024 and 2023:

Cash and Investments outside City Treasury

Investments	Credit Ratings (S&P/Moody's)	June 30, 2024 Maturities	Fair Value	Investments exempt from fair value	Fair Value Measurements Using: Quoted prices in active markets for identical assets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Unobservable inputs (Level 3)
U.S. Treasury Money Market Funds	AAAm/Aaa-mf	< 90 days	$ 22,815	22,815	–	–	–
Money Market Funds	A-1/P-1	< 90 days	43	43	–	–	–
Commercial Paper-Toyota Motor Corp	A-1+/P-1	October 11, 2024	45,422	–	45,422	–	–
Commercial Paper-Toronto-Dominion Bank	A-1+/P-1	October 28, 2024	10,310	–	10,310	–	–
U.S. Agency Securities	AA+/Aaa	April 17, 2025	10,083	–	10,083	–	–
Cash and Cash Equivalents	N/A		14,577	14,577	–	–	–
Total Restricted Cash and Investments outside City Treasury			$ 103,250	37,435	65,815	–	–
Cash and Cash Equivalents	N/A		$ 193	193	–	–	–
Total Unrestricted Cash and Investments outside City Treasury			$ 193	193	–	–	–

Cash and Investments outside City Treasury

Investments	Credit Ratings (S&P/Moody's)	June 30, 2023 Maturities	Fair Value	Investments exempt from fair value	Fair Value Measurements Using: Quoted prices in active markets for identical assets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Unobservable inputs (Level 3)
U.S. Treasury Money Market Funds	AAAm/Aaa-mf	< 90 days	$ 64,249	64,249	–	–	–
Money Market Funds	A-1+/P-1	< 90 days	43	43	–	–	–
Cash and Cash Equivalents	N/A		13,053	13,053	–	–	–
Total Restricted Cash and Investments outside City Treasury			$ 77,345	77,345	–	–	–
Cash and Cash Equivalents	N/A		$ 192	192	–	–	–
Total Unrestricted Cash and Investments outside City Treasury			$ 192	192	–	–	–

Certain investments such as money market investments, and cash and cash equivalents are not subject to the fair value hierarchy.

The restricted cash and investments outside City Treasury as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 included an unrealized gain due to changes in fair value on commercial paper of $540 and $0, respectively.

Additional cash outside of the investment pool included revolving fund and cash in transit. The revolving fund has a balance of $28 and $28 as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively, which is held in a commercial bank in non-interest bearing checking accounts covered by Federal Deposit

(Continued)

Insurance Corporation depository insurance. These accounts were established as provided by the City's Administrative Code for revolving fund needs. The cash in transit was $165 and $164 as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively.

The Enterprise's cash, cash equivalents, and investments are shown on the accompanying statements of net position as follows:

	2024	2023
Current assets:		
Cash and investments with City Treasury	$ 380,201	402,885
Cash and investments outside City Treasury	193	192
Restricted cash and investments outside City Treasury	40,065	10,863
Non-current assets:		
Restricted cash and investments with City Treasury	71,015	21,000
Restricted cash and investments outside City Treasury	63,185	66,482
Total cash, cash equivalents, and investments	$ 554,659	501,422

The following table shows the percentage distribution of the City's pooled investments by maturity:

	Investment maturities (in months)			
Fiscal years ended June 30	Under 1	1 to less than 6	6 to less than 12	12 to 60
2024	22.2%	19.5%	16.3%	42.0%
2023	21.5%	18.0%	14.5%	46.0%

As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise has the following commercial paper investments that represent 5.0% or more of the total investments outside City Treasury:

	Fair Value	% of Investments
Toyota Motor Corp	$ 45,422	51.2 %
Toronto-Dominion Bank	10,310	11.6

(Continued)

(4) Capital Assets

Capital assets as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 consist of the following:

	2023	Increases	Decreases	2024
Capital assets not being depreciated and amortized:				
Land and rights-of-way	$ 113,322	—	—	113,322
Intangible assets	679	—	—	679
Construction work in progress	526,994	220,970	(141,160) *	606,804
Total capital assets not being depreciated and amortized	640,995	220,970	(141,160)	720,805
Capital assets being depreciated and amortized:				
Facilities and improvements	6,755,307	191,146	—	6,946,453
Intangible assets	26,121	1,593	—	27,714
Machinery and equipment	337,799	8,138	(131)	345,806
Right-to-use lease assets	8,208	—	(1,197)	7,011
Right-to-use subscription assets	2,450	—	(1,590)	860
Total capital assets being depreciated and amortized	7,129,885	200,877	(2,918)	7,327,844
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization for:				
Facilities and improvements	(1,828,932)	(141,039)	—	(1,969,971)
Intangible assets	(24,469)	(1,267)	—	(25,736)
Machinery and equipment	(258,507)	(11,273)	131	(269,649)
Right-to-use lease assets	(4,265)	(1,209)	1,197	(4,277)
Right-to-use subscription assets	(1,755)	(384)	1,590	(549)
Total accumulated depreciation and amortization	(2,117,928)	(155,172)	2,918	(2,270,182)
Total capital assets being depreciated and amortized, net	5,011,957	45,705	—	5,057,662
Total capital assets, net	$ 5,652,952	266,675	(141,160)	5,778,467

* Decrease in construction work in progress includes $58 in capital project write-offs, mainly related to Chlorine Trim Station Repairs project. The remaining difference of $59,775 is mainly due to direct additions to facilities and improvements, intangible assets and machinery and equipment.

	2022	Increases	Decreases	2023
Capital assets not being depreciated and amortized:				
Land and rights-of-way	$ 113,441	—	(119)	113,322
Intangible assets	679	—	—	679
Construction work in progress	444,254	180,391	(97,651) *	526,994
Total capital assets not being depreciated and amortized	558,374	180,391	(97,770)	640,995
Capital assets being depreciated and amortized:				
Facilities and improvements	6,660,691	94,616	—	6,755,307
Intangible assets	25,142	979	—	26,121
Machinery and equipment	332,473	5,905	(579)	337,799
Right-to-use lease assets	5,646	2,562	—	8,208
Right-to-use subscription assets	2,450	—	—	2,450
Total capital assets being depreciated and amortized	7,026,402	104,062	(579)	7,129,885
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization for:				
Facilities and improvements	(1,688,717)	(140,215)	—	(1,828,932)
Intangible assets	(22,669)	(1,800)	—	(24,469)
Machinery and equipment	(247,700)	(11,386)	579	(258,507)
Right-to-use lease assets	(2,834)	(1,431)	—	(4,265)
Right-to-use subscription assets	(873)	(882)	—	(1,755)
Total accumulated depreciation and amortization	(1,962,793)	(155,714)	579	(2,117,928)
Total capital assets being depreciated and amortized, net	5,063,609	(51,652)	—	5,011,957
Total capital assets, net	$ 5,621,983	128,739	(97,770)	5,652,952

* Decrease in construction work in progress includes $4,628 in capital project write-offs, mainly related to Stern Grove Emergency Restoration and Upper Alameda Creek Filter projects. The remaining difference of $10,920 is mainly due to direct additions to facilities and improvements, intangible assets and machinery and equipment.

(Continued)

(5) Restricted Assets

Pursuant to the Indentures, all revenues of the Enterprise (except amounts on deposit in the rebate fund) are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of debt service on the Water Revenue and Refunding Bonds. Accordingly, the revenues of the Enterprise shall not be used for any other purpose while any of its Water Revenue and Refunding Bonds are outstanding, except as expressly permitted by the Indentures. Further, all revenues shall be deposited by the City Treasurer, by instruction of the Enterprise, in special funds designated as the Water Enterprise Revenue Fund (the Water Revenue Fund), which must be maintained in the City Treasury. These funds, held at the City Treasury, are recorded in the statement of net position of the Enterprise as cash and investments. Deposits in the Water Revenue Fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance, and operation of the Enterprise in accordance with the following priority:

1. The payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities;
2. The payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the Enterprise may establish or the Board of Supervisors may require with respect to employees of the Enterprise;
3. The payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure Revenue Bonds and parity State revolving fund loans issued by the Enterprise for the acquisition, construction, or extension of facilities owned, operated, or controlled by the Enterprise;
4. The payment of principal and interest on General Obligation Bonds issued by the City for the Enterprise's purposes;
5. Reconstruction and replacement as determined by the Enterprise or as required by any of the Enterprise's Revenue Bond ordinances duly adopted and approved; and
6. The acquisition of land, real property, or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement, and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances, and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled, or operated by the Enterprise; and for any other lawful purpose of the Enterprise, including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to the Charter.

(Continued)

In accordance with the Indenture, the bond financing program maintains that certain restricted cash and investment balances be held in trust. Restricted assets held in trust consisted of the following as of June 30, 2024 and 2023:

	2024	2023
Cash and investments with City Treasury:		
Water revenue bond construction fund	$ 71,015	21,000
Cash and investments outside City Treasury:		
2010A Water revenue bond fund	—	12
2010B Water revenue bond fund	22,813	21,861
2010D Water revenue bond fund	—	12
2010E Water revenue bond fund	16,495	16,643
2010F Water revenue bond fund	—	8
2010G Water revenue bond fund	18,994	18,178
2015A Water revenue refunding bond fund	7	4
2016A Water revenue refunding bond fund	13	8
2016B Water revenue refunding bond fund	1	1
2016C Water revenue bond fund	4	2
2017A Water revenue bond fund	1	—
2017B Water revenue bond fund	6	2
2017C Water revenue bond fund	—	1
2017D Water revenue refunding bond fund	6	4
2017E Water revenue refunding bond fund	1	1
2019A Water revenue refunding bond fund	7	5
2019B Water revenue refunding bond fund	1	—
2019C Water revenue refunding bond fund	1	—
2020A Water revenue bond fund	4	2
2020B Water revenue bond fund	2	1
2020C Water revenue bond fund	2	1
2020D Water reveune bond fund	1	—
2020E Water revenue refunding bond fund	3	2
2020F Water revenue refunding bond fund	17	13
2020G Water reveune refunding bond fund	1	23
2020H Water revenue refunding bond fund	1	8
2023A Water revenue bond fund	19,235	—
2023B Water revenue bond fund	3,551	—
2023C Water revenue refunding bond fund	99	—
2023D Water revenue refunding bond fund	19	—
2009C Certificates of participation - 525 Golden Gate	965	1,696
2009D Certificates of participation - 525 Golden Gate	7,345	5,761
Commercial Paper - Tax Exempt	17	15
Commercial Paper - Taxable	28	28
Habitat reserve endowment fund	13,610	13,053
Total cash and investments outside City Treasury	103,250	77,345
Interest and other receivables:		
Water bond construction fund including interest, prepaids, and other receivables	3,789	3,514
Due from other government for State Revolving Fund	129,580	36,147
Total restricted assets	$ 307,634	138,006

Restricted assets listed above as cash and investments with City Treasury are held in fund accounts within the Water Revenue Fund of the City Treasury.

(Continued)

(6) Short-Term Debt

The Commission and the Board of Supervisors have authorized the overall Interim Funding Program issuance of up to $500,000, pursuant to the voter-approved 2002 Proposition E. The program is made up of two components: (1) three series totaling $400,000 (aggregate principal amount) that are for the issuance of either tax-exempt or taxable commercial paper and which are each supported by a high-grade bank credit facility in the form of a letter of credit or bank liquidity facility; and (2) one series that is for a $100,000 direct bank loan that can be used to make tax-exempt or taxable draws from a high-grade bank pursuant to a revolving credit agreement. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, amounts outstanding under Proposition E were $190,000 and $371,59, respectively. Commercial paper interest rates ranged from 3.9% to 5.5%.

With maturities up to 270 days, the Enterprise intends to maintain the program by remarketing the commercial paper upon maturity over the near-to-medium term, at which time outstanding commercial paper will likely be refunded with revenue bonds. This is being done to take advantage of the continued low interest rate environment. If the commercial paper interest rates rise to a level that exceeds these benefits, the Enterprise will refinance the commercial paper with the long-term, fixed-rate debt.

As of June 30, 2023, the Enterprise had $371,459 in outstanding commercial paper which were repaid by the 2023 Series AB Water Revenue Bonds issued in July 2023. The $371,459 has been reclassed to long-term liabilities on the financial statements.

The commercial paper notes can be issued in the aggregate principal amounts of up to $500,000 and may be marketed and re-marketed with maturities up to 270 days and are secured by three separate bank letters of credit and one revolving note, as set forth below. The commercial paper notes and the revolving notes are payable from revenues, and are secured on a parity lien basis with each other. The commercial paper notes and the revolving notes, collectively, are secured on a basis subordinate to the payment of debt service on outstanding bonds and SRF Loans.

As of June 30, 2024, the commercial paper notes are secured by the following series. Series A-1/A-1-T, has a $100 million letter of credit from Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation, acting through its New York Branch, which expires on May 16, 2025. The agreement for the Series A-1/A-1-T credit facility stipulates a quarterly commitment fee of .33%, on the maintenance of ratings of at least “AA-” by S&P and “Aa3” by Moody’s. Series A-2/A-2-T, has a $200 million letter of credit from Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation, acting through its New York Branch, which expires on June 14, 2027. The agreement for the Series A-2/A-2-T credit facility stipulates a quarterly commitment fee of .29%, on the maintenance of ratings of at least “AA-” by S&P and “Aa3” by Moody’s. Series A-3/A-3-T, has a $100 million letter of credit from Barclays Bank PLC which expires on July 19, 2024. The agreement for the Series A-3/A-3-T credit facility stipulates a quarterly commitment fee of .29%, on the maintenance of ratings of at least “AA-” by S&P and “Aa3” by Moody’s.

BofA Securities, Inc., J.P. Morgan Securities LLC and Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, serve as dealers for the commercial paper notes. The annual fee paid to the dealer equals .05% of the average outstanding principal amount of the Notes managed by the Dealer.

The revolving notes were issued pursuant to a $100 million revolving credit agreement with U.S. Bank National Association which expires on July 18, 2024. The revolving credit agreement stipulates an unutilized quarterly commitment fee of .21%, on the maintenance of ratings of at least “AA-” by S&P and “Aa3” by Moody’s. The revolving credit agreement had $0 outstanding as of June 30, 2024.

(Continued)

The commercial paper reimbursement agreement and the commercial paper revolving credit and term loan agreements for the Enterprise, contain a provision that in the event advances (or drawings) remain unpaid, such advances (or drawings) will convert into term loans and will be subject to the repayment provisions relating thereto.

In accordance with GASB Statement No. 88, *Certain Disclosures Related to Debt, Including Direct Borrowing and Direct Placements*, the Enterprise had $310,000 and $128,541 in unused authorization as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively. Significant events of default include 1) payment defaults 2) material breach of warranty, representation, or other non-remedied breach of covenants as specified in the respective agreements (not cured within applicable grace periods) and 3) bankruptcy and insolvency events, which may result in all outstanding obligations to be immediately due and payable (unless waived by the respective Bank, if applicable); or issuance of a No-Issuance Notice, reduction in credit to outstanding amount plus interest coverage, and/or termination of the respective agreement. As of June 30, 2024, there were no such events describe herein.

(Continued)

(7) Changes in Long-Term Liabilities

Long-term liability activities for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

	Interest rate	Maturity (Calendar Year)	2023	Additions	Reductions	2024	Due within one year
Revenue Bonds:							
2010B revenue bonds (Build America)	4.00% – 6.00%	2040	$ 336,390	—	(13,245)	323,145	13,725
2010E revenue bonds (Build America)	4.90 – 6.00	2040	331,455	—	(13,165)	318,290	13,610
2010G revenue bonds (Build America)	6.95	2050	351,470	—	—	351,470	—
2015A revenue refunding bonds	2.00 – 5.00	2036	366,375	—	(92,240)	274,135	29,485
2016A revenue refunding bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2039	686,945	—	(113,445)	573,500	24,800
2016B revenue refunding bonds	1.50 – 5.00	2030	58,980	—	(13,175)	45,805	13,720
2016C revenue bonds	0.87 – 4.19	2046	225,275	—	(6,105)	219,170	6,275
2017A revenue bonds	5.00	2047	24,675	—	(2,445)	22,230	2,570
2017B revenue bonds	5.00	2047	30,095	—	(2,985)	27,110	3,135
2017C revenue bonds	5.00	2047	14,395	—	(1,425)	12,970	1,500
2017D revenue refunding bonds	2.00 – 5.00	2035	345,340	—	(88,045)	257,295	10,230
2017E revenue refunding bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2031	48,125	—	(795)	47,330	835
2017F revenue refunding bonds	5.00	2031	8,005	—	(735)	7,270	770
2017G revenue refunding bonds	2.03 – 2.91	2024	18,890	—	(13,665)	5,225	5,225
2019A revenue refunding bonds	1.81 – 3.47	2043	587,825	—	(194,745)	393,080	2,700
2019B revenue refunding bonds	3.15 – 3.52	2041	16,315	—	(70)	16,245	75
2019C revenue refunding bonds	3.15 – 3.52	2041	17,775	—	(80)	17,695	80
2020A revenue bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2050	150,895	—	—	150,895	—
2020B revenue bonds	5.00	2050	61,330	—	—	61,330	—
2020C revenue bonds	4.00	2050	85,335	—	—	85,335	—
2020D revenue bonds	3.00	2050	49,200	—	—	49,200	—
2020E revenue refunding bonds	2.83 – 2.95	2047	335,035	—	(151,400)	183,635	915
2020F revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.15	2047	135,455	—	(1,430)	134,025	1,440
2020G revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.10	2043	108,970	—	(44,310)	64,660	6,360
2020H revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.15	2047	64,815	—	(685)	64,130	690
2023A revenue bonds	5.00-5.25	2052	—	349,495	—	349,495	—
2023B revenue bonds	5.00-5.25	2052	—	64,540	—	64,540	—
2023C revenue refunding bonds	4.00-5.00	2043	—	486,875	—	486,875	—
2023D revenue refunding bonds	5.00	2035	—	27,980	—	27,980	—
Less issuance discount			(115)	—	8	(107)	—
Add issuance premiums			251,596	136,522	(57,439)	330,679	—
Total revenue bonds payable			4,710,846	1,065,412	(811,621)	4,964,637	138,140
2009D COPs (Build America)	6.36 – 6.49	2041	92,499	—	(3,267)	89,232	3,402
Commercial paper *	2.20 – 5.15	2023	371,459	—	(371,459)	—	—
State Revolving Funds Loan	1.00 – 1.10	2057	163,627	97,477	(1,134)	259,970	—
Accrued interest payable			35,104	221,095	(214,653)	41,546	37,924
Net other postemployment benefits liability			148,601	9,700	—	158,301	—
Lease liability			4,010	—	(1,189)	2,821	1,028
Subscription liability			708	—	(400)	308	153
Net pension liability			115,343	37,300	—	152,643	—
Arbitrage rebate payable			—	869	—	869	—
Accrued vacation and sick leave			13,585	13,724	(13,306)	14,003	7,585
Accrued workers' compensation			9,735	4,336	(3,069)	11,002	2,188
Damage claims liability			19,625	18,823	(15,675)	22,773	5,716
Pollution remediation obligation			1,271	—	—	1,271	—
Total			$ 5,686,413	1,468,736	(1,435,773)	5,719,376	196,136

* Commercial paper recorded as short-term liability in FY24

(Continued)

	Interest rate	Maturity (Calendar Year)	2022	Additions	Reductions	2023	Due within one year
Revenue Bonds:							
2010B revenue bonds (Build America)	4.00% – 6.00%	2040	$ 349,170	—	(12,780)	336,390	13,245
2010E revenue bonds (Build America)	4.90 – 6.00	2040	344,200	—	(12,745)	331,455	13,165
2010G revenue bonds (Build America)	6.95	2050	351,470	—	—	351,470	—
2015A revenue refunding bonds	2.00 – 5.00	2036	382,420	—	(16,045)	366,375	28,070
2016A revenue refunding bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2039	719,735	—	(32,790)	686,945	23,590
2016B revenue refunding bonds	1.50 – 5.00	2030	71,510	—	(12,530)	58,980	13,175
2016C revenue bonds	0.87 – 4.19	2046	231,230	—	(5,955)	225,275	6,105
2017A revenue bonds	5.00	2047	27,000	—	(2,325)	24,675	2,445
2017B revenue bonds	5.00	2047	32,930	—	(2,835)	30,095	2,985
2017C revenue bonds	5.00	2047	15,750	—	(1,355)	14,395	1,425
2017D revenue refunding bonds	2.00 – 5.00	2035	346,795	—	(1,455)	345,340	1,270
2017E revenue refunding bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2031	48,890	—	(765)	48,125	795
2017F revenue refunding bonds	5.00	2031	8,705	—	(700)	8,005	735
2017G revenue refunding bonds	2.03 – 2.91	2024	31,960	—	(13,070)	18,890	13,665
2019A revenue refunding bonds	1.81 – 3.47	2043	591,320	—	(3,495)	587,825	3,565
2019B revenue refunding bonds	3.15 – 3.52	2041	16,385	—	(70)	16,315	70
2019C revenue refunding bonds	3.15 – 3.52	2041	17,850	—	(75)	17,775	80
2020A revenue bonds	4.00 – 5.00	2050	150,895	—	—	150,895	—
2020B revenue bonds	5.00	2050	61,330	—	—	61,330	—
2020C revenue bonds	4.00	2050	85,335	—	—	85,335	—
2020D revenue bonds	3.00	2050	49,200	—	—	49,200	—
2020E revenue refunding bonds	2.83 – 2.95	2047	335,535	—	(500)	335,035	1,530
2020F revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.15	2047	135,455	—	—	135,455	1,430
2020G revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.10	2043	114,765	—	(5,795)	108,970	7,065
2020H revenue refunding bonds	0.26 – 3.15	2047	64,815	—	—	64,815	685
Less issuance discount			(124)	—	9	(115)	—
Add issuance premiums			276,409	—	(24,813)	251,596	—
Total revenue bonds payable			4,860,935	—	(150,089)	4,710,846	135,095
2009C certificates of participation (COPs)	2.00 – 5.00	2022	3,124	—	(3,124)	—	—
2009C COPs issuance premiums			14	—	(14)	—	—
2009D COPs (Build America)	6.36 – 6.49	2041	92,499	—	—	92,499	3,267
Commercial paper	1.20 – 5.30	2023	—	371,459	—	371,459	—
State Revolving Funds Loan	1.00 – 1.10	2057	121,761	41,866	—	163,627	—
Net other postemployment benefits liability			144,115	4,486	—	148,601	—
Lease liability			2,863	2,562	(1,415)	4,010	1,189
Subscription liability			1,556	—	(848)	708	400
Net pension liability			—	115,343	—	115,343	—
Accrued vacation and sick leave			13,729	12,427	(12,571)	13,585	7,057
Accrued workers' compensation			8,973	3,984	(3,222)	9,735	1,914
Damage claims liability			36,069	1,898	(18,342)	19,625	11,125
Wholesale balancing account			79,150	—	(79,150)	—	—
Pollution remediation obligation			1,271	—	—	1,271	—
Total			$ 5,366,059	554,025	(268,775)	5,651,309	160,047

(Continued)

The payments of principal and interest amounts on various bonds are secured by net revenues of the Enterprise.

(a) Water Revenue Bonds 2010 Series B

The 2010 Series B Bonds in the par amount of $417,720 were issued as taxable Build America Bonds (BAB) (with Direct Pay Subsidy) to provide $364,757 in new money for WSIP capital projects and pay financing costs. The 2010 Series B bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons ranging from 4.0% to 6.0% and have a final maturity of 2040. The Series B bonds have a true interest cost (net of federal subsidy) of 3.9%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount outstanding was $323,145 and $336,390, respectively.

(b) Water Revenue Bonds 2010 Series E

In July 2010, the 2010 Series E Bonds in the par amount of $344,200 were issued as taxable Build America Bonds (with Direct Pay Subsidy) to provide $300,446 in new money proceeds for WSIP capital projects. The Series E bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons ranging from 4.9% to 6.0% and have a final maturity of 2040. The Series E bonds have a true interest cost (net of federal subsidy) of 3.8%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2010 Series E bonds outstanding was $318,290 and $331,455, respectively.

(c) Water Revenue Bonds 2010 Series G

In December 2010, the $351,470 Series G bonds were issued as taxable Build America Bonds (with Direct Pay Subsidy) to provide $288,252 in new money for WSIP capital projects. The Series G bonds were issued as term bonds with a coupon of 7.0% and have a final maturity of 2050. The Series G bonds have a true interest cost (net of federal subsidy) of 4.5%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2010 Series G bonds outstanding was $351,470.

(d) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2015 Series A

In April 2015, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2015 Series A in the amount of $429,600 for the purpose of refunding all the outstanding 2006 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2015 and portion of the outstanding 2009 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2023. The bonds carried “Aa3” and “AA-” ratings from Moody’s and S&P, respectively. The 2015 Series A bonds include serial bonds with interest rates varying from 2.0% to 5.0% and have a final maturity in 2036. The Series A bonds have a true interest cost of 3.3%. Unamortized 2006 Series A bond issuance costs were $1,392, and there were no unamortized bond issuance costs for 2009 Series A bonds at the date of the refunding. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting loss of $25,365, gross debt service savings of $28,148 over the next 20 two-year terms, and an economic gain of $48,561 or 10.3% of refunded principal.

A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2015 Series A bonds which had been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of maturities of the 2015 Series A bonds starting on November 1, 2028 to November 1, 2033 and November 1, 2036. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2015 Series A bonds outstanding was $274,135 and $366,375, respectively.

(Continued)

(e) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2016 Series AB

In October 2016, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2016 Series AB in the aggregate amount of $893,820. The 2016 Series A bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2009 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, a portion of the outstanding 2009 Series B bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, and a portion of the outstanding 2010 Series F bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2021. The 2016 Series B bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding, on a current basis, all the outstanding 2006 Series B and Series C bonds, and a portion of the outstanding 2010 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, the bonds carried "Aa3" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2016 Series AB bonds include serial bonds with interest rates varying from 1.5% to 5.0% and have a final maturity in 2039. The Series AB bonds have a true interest cost of 2.9%. Unamortized bond issuance costs at the date of refunding were $145 for 2006 Series B bonds and $54 for 2006 Series C bonds. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting loss of $106,205, gross debt service savings of $135,966, and an economic gain of $107,152 or 11.5% of refunded principal.

A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2016 Series A bonds which had been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of maturities of the 2016 Series A bonds starting on November 1, 2031 to November 1, 2035. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2016 Series AB bonds outstanding was $619,305 and $745,925, respectively.

(f) Water Revenue Bonds 2016 Series C

In December 2016, the Enterprise issued taxable bonds, 2016 Series C in the amount of $259,350. The bonds were issued as Green Bonds. The purpose of the bonds was to refund all of the outstanding taxable commercial paper notes in the approximate amount of $237,000, and to provide $19,975 of new money for WSIP capital projects. The bonds carried "Aa3" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2016 Series C bonds include serial bonds with interest rates varying from 0.9% to 4.0% and have a final maturity in 2046, and two term bonds with 4.0% and 4.2% interest rates and final maturities of 2041 and 2046. The Series C bonds have a true interest cost of 3.9%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2016 Series C bonds outstanding was $219,170 and $225,275, respectively.

(g) Water Revenue Bonds 2017 Series ABC

In December 2017, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2017 ABC in the aggregate amount of $339,540. The purpose of the 2017 Series ABC Bonds was to refund approximately $120,500 aggregate principal amount of commercial paper notes and to provide $230,500 new money for WSIP capital projects, other various capital projects of the Water Enterprise, and capital projects of Hetch Hetchy Water. The bonds carried "Aa3" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2017 Series ABC bonds include serial bonds with coupon rates of 5.0% and have final maturity in 2045, and four term bonds with coupons of 5.0% and final maturities from 2045 to 2047.

The $121,140 2017 Series A bonds were issued as tax-exempt Green Bonds to refund approximately $60,265 of commercial paper notes and to provide $65,500 in new money for WSIP capital projects. The Series A bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons of 5.0% and a final maturity of 2047. The Series A bonds have a true interest cost of 3.8%. A

(Continued)

portion of the proceeds of the 2020 Series E refunding bonds were deposited with the trustee, acting as escrow agent under the irrevocable Escrow Agreement dated October 1, 2020 to refund and legally defease a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series A bonds. These deposits, together with certain other available monies were held by the escrow agent under the Escrow Agreement and invested in non-callable Federal Securities. The principal and interest on monies held by the escrow agent will be sufficient to redeem the maturities of the 2017 Series A bonds starting on November 1, 2030 and thereafter. The defeased principal amount outstanding for the 2017 Series A Revenue Bonds were $94,140 as June 30, 2024. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2017 Series A bonds outstanding was $22,230 and $24,675, respectively.

The $147,725 2017 Series B bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to provide $150,000 in new money for Water Enterprise capital projects (non-WSIP). The Series B bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons of 5.0% and have a final maturity of 2047. The Series B bonds have a true interest cost of 3.8%. A portion of the proceeds of the 2020 Series F refunding bonds were deposited with the trustee, acting as escrow agent under the irrevocable Escrow Agreement dated October 1, 2020 to refund and legally defease a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series B bonds. These deposits, together with certain other available monies were held by the escrow agent under the Escrow Agreement and invested in non-callable Federal Securities. The principal and interest on monies held by the escrow agent will be sufficient to redeem the maturities of the 2017 Series B bonds starting on November 1, 2030 and thereafter. The defeased principal amount outstanding for the 2017 Series B Revenue Bonds were $114,795 as of June 30, 2024. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2017 Series B bonds outstanding was $27,110 and $30,095, respectively.

The $70,675 2017 Series C bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to refund approximately $60,266 of commercial paper notes and to provide $15,000 in new money for Hetch Hetchy Water capital projects. The Series C bonds were issued as serial bonds and a term bond with coupons of 5.0% and have a final maturity of 2047. The Series C bonds have a true interest cost of 3.8%. A portion of the proceeds of the 2020 Series H refunding bonds were deposited with the trustee, acting as escrow agent under the irrevocable Escrow Agreement dated October 1, 2020 to refund and legally defease a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series C bonds. These deposits, together with certain other available monies were held by the escrow agent under the Escrow Agreement and invested in non-callable Federal Securities. The principal and interest on monies held by the escrow agent will be sufficient to redeem the maturities of the 2017 Series C bonds starting on November 1, 2030 and thereafter. The defeased principal amount outstanding for the 2017 Series C Revenue Bonds were $54,925 as of June 30, 2024. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2017 Series C bonds outstanding was $12,970 and $14,395, respectively.

(h) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2017 Series DEFG

In December 2017, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2017 Series DEF, and taxable 2017 Series G refunding bonds in the aggregate amount of $442,180. The 2017 Series D (WSIP, Green) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series A (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2022, a portion of the outstanding 2012 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2031. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2017 Series D bonds which had been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023

(Continued)

Series C bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of maturities of the 2017 Series D bonds starting on November 1, 2031 to November 1, 2035.

The 2017 Series E bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series C bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2022, a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series D bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2022, a portion of 2012 Series C1 bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2029.

The 2017 Series F bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series B bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2022.

The taxable 2017 Series G (WSIP, Green) bonds were issued to refund a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series A bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2022.

The bonds carried "Aa3" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2017 Series DEFG bonds include serial bonds with interest rates varying from 2.0% to 5.0% and have a final maturity in 2035. The Series DEFG bonds have a true interest cost of 2.9%. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting loss of $34,275, gross debt service savings of $68,942, and an economic gain of $51,698 or 10.7% of refunded principal. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2017 Series DEFG bonds outstanding was $317,120 and $420,360, respectively.

(i) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2019 Series ABC

In January 2020, the Enterprise issued taxable revenue bonds, 2019 Series ABC refunding bonds in the aggregate amount of $656,955. The 2019 Series A (WSIP, Green) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2010 Series F (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series A (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, and a portion of the outstanding 2012 Series A (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2035. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C refunding bonds were deposited with the trustee, acting as escrow agent under the irrevocable Escrow Agreement dated August 1, 2023 to refund and legally defease a portion of the outstanding 2019 Series A bonds. These deposits, together with certain other available monies were held by the escrow agent under the Escrow Agreement and invested in non-callable Federal Securities. The principal and interest on monies held by the escrow agent will be sufficient to redeem portions of the maturities of the 2019 Series A bonds starting on November 1, 2024 to November 1, 2026 and November 1, 2029 to November 1 2033. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2019 Series A bonds which had been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of portions of maturities of the 2019 Series A bonds starting on November 1, 2026 to November 1, 2032, November 1, 2034, November 1, 2039 and November 1, 2043. The defeased principal amount outstanding for 2019 Series A Revenue Bonds were $5,745 as of June 30, 2024.

The 2019 Series B (Hetch Hetchy Water) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series B bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2032.

The 2019 Series C (Local) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2011 Series C bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2032.

The bonds carried "Aa2" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2019 Series ABC bonds include serial bonds with interest rates varying from 1.8% to 3.5% and have a final maturity in 2043. The Series ABC bonds have a true interest cost of 3.3%. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting loss of $17,329, gross debt service savings of $119,827, and an economic gain of $92,556 or 14.0% of refunded principal. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2019 Series ABC bonds outstanding was $427,020 and $621,915, respectively.

(j) Water Revenue Bonds 2020 Series ABCD

In September 2020, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2020 Series ABCD in the aggregate amount of $346,760. The purpose of the 2020 Series ABCD Bonds was to refund approximately $229,770 aggregate principal amount of commercial paper notes and to provide $164,632 new money for various capital projects of the Water Enterprise, and capital projects of Hetch Hetchy Water. The bonds carried "Aa2" and "AA-" ratings from Moody's and S&P, respectively. The 2020 Series ABCD bonds include term bonds with coupons of 3.0% to 5.0% and final maturity in 2050.

The $150,895 2020 Series A bonds were issued as tax-exempt Green Bonds to refund approximately $180,000 of commercial paper notes for WSIP capital projects. The Series A bonds were issued as term bonds with coupons of 4.0% and 5.0% and a final maturity of 2050. The 2020 Series A bonds have a true interest cost of 3.3%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2020 Series A bonds outstanding was $150,895.

The $61,330 Series B bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to provide $69,644 in new money for Water Enterprise capital projects (non-WSIP, Regional). The Series B bonds were issued as term bonds with coupons of 5.0% and have a final maturity of 2050. The Series B bonds have a true interest cost of 3.7%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2020 Series B bonds outstanding was $61,330.

The $85,335 Series C bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to provide $94,948 in new money for Water Enterprise capital projects (non-WSIP, Local). The Series C bonds were issued as term bonds with coupons of 4.0% and have a final maturity of 2050. The Series C bonds have a true interest cost of 3.0%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2020 Series C bonds outstanding was $85,335.

The $49,200 Series D bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to refund approximately $49,761 of commercial paper notes for Hetch Hetchy Water capital projects. The Series D bonds were issued as term bonds with coupons of 3.0% and a final maturity of 2050. The 2020 Series D bonds have a true interest cost of 2.7%. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2020 Series D bonds outstanding was $49,200.

(k) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2020 Series EFGH

In October 2020, the Enterprise issued taxable revenue bonds, 2020 Series EFGH refunding bonds in the aggregate amount of $664,395. The 2020 Series E (WSIP, Green) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2010 Series D (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2020, a portion of the outstanding 2012 Series A (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2038, and a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series A (WSIP) bonds maturing on and after November 1, 2030. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2020 Series E bonds which had

(Continued)

been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023 Series C bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of the 2020 Series E bonds maturing November 1, 2041.

The 2020 Series F (non-WSIP, Regional) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series B bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2030.

The 2020 Series G (non-WSIP, Local) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2010 Series D bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2020, a portion of the 2011 Series D bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2022, a portion of 2012 Series B bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2031, and a portion of 2012 Series C bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2025. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series D refunding bonds were deposited with the trustee, acting as escrow agent under the irrevocable Escrow Agreement dated August 1, 2023 to refund and legally defease a portion of the outstanding 2020 Series G bonds. These deposits, together with certain other available monies were held by the escrow agent under the Escrow Agreement and invested in non-callable Federal Securities. The principal and interest on monies held by the escrow agent will be sufficient to redeem portions of the maturities of the 2020 Series G bonds maturing on November 1, 2024 and November 1, 2025. A portion of the proceeds of the 2023 Series D bonds were used to pay at closing a portion of the 2020 Series G bonds which had been tendered for purchase on August 10, 2023. The proceeds of the 2023 Series D bonds were sufficient to pay the accrued interest and tender price of portions of maturities of the 2020 Series G bonds starting on November 1, 2026 to November 1, 2032 and November 1, 2035. The defeased principal amount outstanding for the 2020 Series G Revenue Bonds was $1,495 as of June 30, 2024.

The 2020 Series H (Hetch Hetchy Water) bonds were issued for the purpose of refunding a portion of the outstanding 2017 Series C bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2030.

The bonds carried “Aa2” and “AA-” ratings from Moody’s and S&P, respectively. The 2020 Series EFGH bonds include serial bonds and term bonds with interest rates varying from 0.3% to 3.1% and have a final maturity in 2047. The Series EFGH bonds have a true interest cost of 2.7%. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting loss of $27,010, gross debt service savings of $117,114, and an economic gain of $75,212 or 12.0% of refunded principal. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the principal amount of 2020 Series EFGH bonds outstanding was $446,450 and $644,275, respectively.

(l) Water Revenue Bonds 2023 Series AB

In July 2023, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2023 Series AB in the aggregate amount of $414,035. The purpose of the 2023 Series AB Bonds was to refund approximately $373,000 aggregate principal amount of commercial paper notes and to provide approximately $59,341 new money for various capital projects of the Water Enterprise, and capital projects of Hetch Hetchy Water. The bonds carried “Aa2” and “AA-” ratings from Moody’s and S&P, respectively. The 2023 Series AB bonds include serial and term bonds with coupons of 5.0% to 5.3% and final maturities in 2052.

The $349,495 2023 Series A bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to refund approximately $305,625 of commercial paper notes for Water Enterprise capital projects and to provide approximately $59,299 new money for various capital projects for the Water Enterprise. The Series A bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons of 5.0% to 5.3% and a final

maturity of 2052. The Series A bonds have a true interest cost of 4.1%. As of June 30, 2024, the principal amount of 2023 Series A bonds outstanding was $349,495.

The $64,540 Series B bonds were issued as tax-exempt bonds to refund approximately $67,348 of commercial paper notes for Hetch Hetchy Water capital projects and approximately $42 in new money for Hetch Hetchy Water capital projects. The Series B bonds were issued as serial and term bonds with coupons of 5.0% to 5.3% and have a final maturity of 2052. The Series B bonds have a true interest cost of 4.1%. As of June 30, 2024, the principal amount of 2023 Series B bonds outstanding was $64,540.

(m) Water Revenue Refunding Bonds 2023 Series CD

In August 2023, the Enterprise issued tax-exempt revenue bonds, 2023 Series CD refunding bonds in the aggregate amount of $514,855. The 2023 Series C (WSIP, Green) bonds were issued for the purpose of paying the purchase price of a portion of the 2015 Series A revenue bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2028, a portion of the 2016 Series A revenue bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2031, a portion of the 2017 Series D revenue bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2031, a portion of the 2019 Series A (WSIP, Green) revenue bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2026, and a portion of the 2020 Series E (WSIP, Green) revenue bonds maturing on November 1, 2041 that were tendered for cash and advance refund portions of 2019 Series A maturing on or after November 1, 2024.

The 2023 Series D (Local Water) bonds were issued for the purpose of paying the purchase price of a portion of the 2020 Series G bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2026 that were tendered for cash and advance refund portions of 2020 Series G bonds maturing on or after November 1, 2024.

The bonds carried “Aa2” and “AA-” ratings from Moody’s and S&P, respectively. The 2023 Series CD bonds include serial bonds with interest rates of 4.0% to 5.0% and have a final maturity in 2043. The Series CD bonds have a true interest cost of 3.2%. The refunding resulted in the recognition of a deferred accounting gain of $33,378, gross debt service savings of approximately $85,376, and an economic gain of $58,518 or 9.5% of refunded principal. As of June 30, 2024, the principal amount of 2023 Series CD bonds outstanding was $514,855.

(n) Future Annual Debt Service of Revenue Bonds

The following table presents the future annual debt service relating to the revenue and refunding bonds outstanding as of June 30, 2024. The federal interest subsidy amounts represent 35.0%, excluding sequestration, of the interest for the revenue bond 2010 Series B, E, and G.

(Continued)

	Principal	Interest before subsidy	Federal interest subsidy*	Interest net of subsidy
Fiscal years ending June 30:				
2025	$ 138,140	214,379	(20,370)	194,009
2026	149,540	207,947	(19,876)	188,071
2027	154,735	200,835	(19,345)	181,490
2028	159,210	193,311	(18,772)	174,539
2029	174,380	185,123	(18,164)	166,959
2030-2034	989,480	790,528	(79,528)	711,000
2035-2039	1,169,760	530,841	(53,376)	477,465
2040-2044	858,385	286,469	(25,530)	260,939
2045-2049	529,695	147,127	(12,339)	134,788
2050-2053	310,740	21,931	(1,184)	20,747
	4,634,065	2,778,491	(268,484)	2,510,007
Less: Current portion	(138,140)			
Less: Unamortized bond discount	(107)			
Add: Unamortized bond premiums	330,679			
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$ 4,826,497			

* The SFPUC received an IRS notice dated April 17, 2024 that the federal interest subsidies on the 2010 Series B bonds, 2010 Series E bonds, and 2010 Series G bonds are reduced by 5.7%, or a total reduction of $16,228, due to sequestration over the remaining life of the bonds assuming the sequestration rate will remain the same after fiscal year 2024.

As defined in the Indentures, the principal and interest of the Enterprise's revenue and refunding bonds are payable from its revenues, as well as monies deposited in certain funds and accounts pledged thereto (see Note 5).

(o) Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) Loan and Grant

In September 2017, the SFPUC entered into an Installment Sale Agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board for a Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) Loan and Grant to fund the Enterprise's SF Westside Recycled Water Project. The CWSRF loan is in the amount of $191,094, which includes $15,000 of principal forgiveness, or a grant. It will bear an interest rate of 1.0% for a 30-year term, with loan repayment beginning one year after substantial completion of project construction. The CWSRF loan is secured on a parity lien basis with the Enterprise's outstanding revenue bonds. The principal outstanding as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 was $154,178 and $131,525, respectively. In addition, there was $15,000 of principal forgiveness in fiscal year 2023.

(Continued)

California Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan		Principal	Interest	Total
Fiscal years ending June 30:				
2025	$	—	—	—
2026		4,432	1,542	5,974
2027		4,477	1,497	5,974
2028		4,521	1,453	5,974
2029		4,567	1,407	5,974
2030-2034		23,526	6,342	29,868
2035-2039		24,728	5,143	29,871
2040-2044		25,989	3,882	29,871
2045-2049		27,315	2,556	29,871
2050-2054		28,708	1,163	29,871
2055		5,915	60	5,975
		154,178	25,045	179,223
Less: Current portion		—		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$	154,178		

(p) Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Loan

In April 2022, the SFPUC entered into an Installment Sale Agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board for a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Loan to fund the Enterprise's Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project. The DWSRF loan is in the amount of $238,219. It will bear an interest rate of 1.1% for a 30-year term, with interest payments beginning annually after the initial loan proceed draw occurs and loan principal repayment beginning one year after substantial completion of project construction. Power Enterprise is responsible for repayment for its share of SRF Loan debt service costs representing up to its allocable share of the cost of the Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project by a Memorandum of Understanding that will be executed with the Water Enterprise. The DWSRF loan is secured on a parity lien basis with the Enterprise's outstanding revenue bonds. The principal outstanding as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 was $105,792 and $32,102, respectively.

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Loan		Principal	Interest	Total
Fiscal years ending June 30:				
2025	$	—	—	—
2026		—	—	—
2027		—	—	—
2028		—	—	—
2029		3,041	1,058	4,099
2030-2034		15,669	4,827	20,496
2035-2039		16,468	4,028	20,496
2040-2044		17,308	3,188	20,496
2045-2049		18,191	2,305	20,496
2050-2054		19,119	1,377	20,496
2055-2058		15,996	402	16,398
		105,792	17,185	122,977
Less: Current portion		—		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$	105,792		

(Continued)

(q) Proposition A

On November 5, 2002, the San Francisco voters passed Proposition A, which provides for the issuance of revenue bonds and/or other forms of indebtedness by the Commission in a principal amount not to exceed $1,628,000 to finance the acquisition and construction of improvements to the City's Water System. As of June 30, 2023, there was no commercial paper outstanding pursuant to this authorization and $1,499,230 of bonds had been issued in fiscal years 2006, 2010, 2012, and 2021 against Prop A. The total authorization against Prop A was $1,499,230 as of June 30, 2024.

(r) Proposition E

On November 5, 2002, the San Francisco voters passed Proposition E, which authorizes the Board of Supervisors' approval of the issuance of revenue bonds and/or other forms of indebtedness by the Commission to finance costs for the Commission's capital programs, including WSIP. As of June 30, 2024, the Board of Supervisors authorized the issuance of $6,157,510 in revenue bonds with $4,317,653 issued against this authorization; in September 2017 and amended in April 2023, the SFPUC entered into an Installment Sale Agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board for a Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) Loan and Grant to fund the Enterprise's SF Westside Recycled Water Project in the amount of $191,094 (which includes a $15,000 grant) and in April 2022, the SFPUC entered in to an Installment Sale Agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board for a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Loan to fund the Mountain Tunnel Improvement Project in the amount of $238,219. Additionally, $190,000 and $371,459 in commercial paper were outstanding pursuant to this authorization as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively.

(s) Certificates of Participation Issued for the 525 Golden Gate Avenue Headquarters Building

In October 2009, the City issued $167,670 in certificates of participation to fund the headquarters building of the SFPUC at 525 Golden Gate Avenue. The 2009 Series C were issued for $38,120 and 2009 Series D for $129,550 as "Build America Bonds" on a taxable basis under the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The 2009 Series C certificates carry interest rates ranging from 2.0% to 5.0% and mature on November 1, 2022. The 2009 Series D certificates carry interest rates ranging from 6.4% to 6.5% and mature on November 1, 2041, after adjusting for the federal interest subsidy, the true interest cost averages 3.4% and 4.3% for Series C and Series D, respectively.

Under the terms of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City and the SFPUC dated October 1, 2009, the City conveyed the real property to the Trustee, the Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, N.A., which was replaced by U.S. Bank in March 2014 under a property lease in exchange for the proceeds of the sale of the certificates. The Trustee has leased the property back to the City for the City's use under a project lease. The City is obligated under the project lease to pay base rental payments and other payments to the Trustee each year during the 32-year term of the project lease. The Commission makes annual base rental payments to the City for the building equal to annual debt service on the certificates. It is anticipated these lease costs will be offset with reductions in costs associated with current office rental expense. There are no events of default stated in the MOU.

Each of the three Enterprises has an ownership interest in the building equal to their projected usage of space as follows: Water (73%), Wastewater (15%), and Power (12%). Similarly, each Enterprise is responsible for a portion of the annual base rental payment based on their

(Continued)

ownership percentages less contributed equity. The percentage share of base rental payments for the Enterprises is as follows: Water (71.4%), Wastewater (18.9%), and Power (9.7%).

The future annual debt services relating to the certificates of participation 2009 Series D outstanding as of June 30, 2024 are as follows:

Certificates of Participation 2009 Series D (Taxable)	Principal	Interest before subsidy	Federal interest subsidy *	Interest net of subsidy
Fiscal years ending June 30:				
2025	$ 3,402	5,652	(1,865)	3,787
2026	3,545	5,431	(1,792)	3,639
2027	3,695	5,201	(1,716)	3,485
2028	3,852	4,961	(1,637)	3,324
2029	4,013	4,710	(1,555)	3,155
2030-2034	22,762	19,369	(6,393)	12,976
2035-2039	28,071	11,157	(3,682)	7,475
2040-2042	19,892	1,972	(651)	1,321
Total	89,232	58,453	(19,291)	39,162
Less: Current portion	(3,402)			
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$ 85,830			

* The SFPUC received an IRS notice dated April 17, 2024 that the federal interest subsidy on the 2009 Series D bonds is reduced by 5.7%, or a total reduction of $1,166, due to sequestration over the remaining life of the bonds assuming the sequestration rate will remain the same after fiscal year 2024.

(t) Events of Default and Remedies

Significant Events of default as specified in the Water Enterprise Indenture (applicable to Water Revenue Bonds, and SRF Loan) include 1) Non-payment 2) material breach of warranty, representation or indenture covenants (not cured within applicable grace periods) and 3) bankruptcy and insolvency events, which may result in the Trustee (upon written request by the majority of the owners (by aggregate amount of the bond obligations or of a credit provider), declaring the principal and the interest accrued thereon, to be due and payable immediately. As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, there were no such events describe herein.

(8) Revenue Pledge

The Enterprise has pledged future revenues to repay various revenue bonds and State Revolving Fund loans. Proceeds from the revenue bonds and State Revolving Fund loans provided financing for various capital construction projects, and to refund previously issued bonds. The bonds and State Revolving Fund loans are payable solely from revenues of the Enterprise through the fiscal year ending 2058.

The outstanding amount of revenue bonds and State Revolving Funds loan, total principal and interest remaining, principal and interest paid during fiscal years 2024 and 2023, applicable net revenues and funds available for debt service are as follows:

	2024	2023
Bonds issued with revenue pledge	$ 4,634,065	4,459,365
Principal and interest remaining due at the end of the year	7,714,756	7,193,317
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) loans with revenue pledge	259,970	163,627
Principal and interest paid net of capitalized interest and BAB subsidy during the year	306,369	307,062
Net revenues for the year ended June 30	337,985	372,689
Funds available for debt service*	555,585	566,764

* Includes other available funds budgetary balances that are non GAAP

(9) Leases

Water Enterprise as Lessee

The Enterprise has entered into long-term leases for land, office space, and communication site. The terms and conditions for these leases vary, which range between 1 – 75 years.

A summary of intangible right-to-use leases during the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 is as follows:

	Balance July 1, 2023	Increases	Decreases	Remeasurements	Balance June 30, 2024
Right-to-use assets:					
Land	$ 605	-	(605)	-	-
Building/Facility	7,603	-	(592)	-	7,011
Total lease assets	8,208	-	(1,197)	-	7,011
Less accumulated amortization:					
Right-to-use assets:					
Land	(580)	(55)	605	-	(30)
Building/Facility	(3,685)	(1,154)	592	-	(4,247)
Total accumulated amortization	(4,265)	(1,209)	1,197	-	(4,277)
Total lease assets, net	$ 3,943	(1,209)	-	-	2,734

	Balance July 1, 2022	Increases	Decreases	Remeasurements	Balance June 30, 2023
Right-to-use assets:					
Land	$ 605	-	-	-	605
Building/Facility	5,041	149	-	2,413	7,603
Total lease assets	5,646	149	-	2,413	8,208
Less accumulated amortization:					
Right-to-use assets:					
Land	(383)	(197)	-	-	(580)
Building/Facility	(2,451)	(1,234)	-	-	(3,685)
Total accumulated amortization	(2,834)	(1,431)	-	-	(4,265)
Total lease assets, net	$ 2,812	(1,282)	-	2,413	3,943

(Continued)

A summary of changes in the related lease liabilities during the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 is as follows:

	Balance July 1, 2023	Additions	Remeasurements	Deductions	Balance June 30, 2024	Amounts Due Within One Year
Water lease liabilities	$ 4,010	-	-	(1,189)	2,821	1,028
Total	$ 4,010	-	-	(1,189)	2,821	1,028

	Balance July 1, 2022	Additions	Remeasurements	Deductions	Balance June 30, 2023	Amounts Due Within One Year
Water lease liabilities	$ 2,863	149	2,413	(1,415)	4,010	1,189
Total	$ 2,863	149	2,413	(1,415)	4,010	1,189

Future annual lease payments for fiscal years 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

Year ending June 30:	Principal amount	Interest amount	Total
2025	$ 1,028	55	1,083
2026	546	32	578
2027	135	26	161
2028	122	23	145
2029	85	21	106
2030-2034	418	77	495
2035-2039	436	29	465
2040-2044	51	1	52
	2,821	264	3,085
Less: current portion	(1,028)		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$ 1,793		

Year ending June 30:	Principal amount	Interest amount	Total
2024	$ 1,189	81	1,270
2025	1,028	55	1,083
2026	546	32	578
2027	135	26	161
2028	122	23	145
2029-2033	416	86	502
2034-2038	445	39	484
2039-2043	129	3	132
	4,010	345	4,355
Less: current portion	(1,189)		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2023	$ 2,821		

Variable lease payments

Variable lease payments, other than those payments that depend on an index or rate or are fixed in substance, are excluded from the measurement of the lease liability. Such amounts are recognized as lease expenses in the period in which the obligation for those payments is incurred.

(Continued)

Certain facility rental leases require the Enterprise to make variable lease payments that based on usage, related to the property taxes levied on the lessor, and insurance payments made by the lessor; these amounts are generally determined annually. The amounts recognized as expense for variable lease payments not included in the measurement of the lease liability were $79 and $263 during the year ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively.

Water Enterprise as Lessor

The Enterprise has leased facilities, easements, communication site and equipment to various tenants. The terms and conditions for these leases vary, which range between 1- 65 years.

Variable payments include percentage of sales, or payments depended on an index made by the lessee; these amounts are generally determined periodically. The Enterprise did not incur revenue related to residual value guarantees or lease termination penalties. The total amounts for lease revenue, interest revenue, and other lease-related revenues recognized during the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 were $1,742 and $1,161, respectively.

(Continued)

Principal and interest requirements to maturity for the lease receivable on June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

Year ended June 30	Principal	Interest	Total
2025	$ 3,246	807	4,053
2026	2,676	748	3,424
2027	2,409	695	3,104
2028	2,423	645	3,068
2029	2,215	595	2,810
2030-2034	10,897	2,348	13,245
2035-2039	8,246	1,280	9,526
2040-2044	363	921	1,284
2045-2049	-	1,056	1,056
2050-2054	-	1,224	1,224
2055-2059	240	1,179	1,419
2060-2064	898	748	1,646
2065-2069	1,291	617	1,908
2070-2074	1,778	433	2,211
2075+	2,381	181	2,562
	$ 39,063	13,477	52,540

Year ended June 30	Principal	Interest	Total
2024	$ 3,521	869	4,390
2025	3,610	821	4,431
2026	3,046	756	3,802
2027	2,721	698	3,419
2028	2,423	645	3,068
2029-2033	10,951	2,571	13,522
2034-2038	9,941	1,477	11,418
2039-2043	828	914	1,742
2044-2048	-	1,027	1,027
2049-2053	-	1,191	1,191
2054-2058	117	1,263	1,380
2059-2063	832	768	1,600
2064-2068	1,208	647	1,855
2069-2073	1,676	475	2,151
2074+	2,756	250	3,006
	$ 43,630	14,372	58,002

(Continued)

(10) Subscription-Based Information Technology Arrangements

Water Enterprise as Subscriber

The Enterprise has noncancellable subscription arrangements (similar to a lease) for the right to use various information technology hardware and software (SBITAs). The terms and conditions for these subscriptions varies, which ranges between 1 – 5 years.

A summary of intangible right-to-use subscription IT assets during the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

		Balance July 1, 2023	Increases	Decreases	Remeasurements	Balance June 30, 2024
Subscription assets	$	2,450	-	(1,590)	-	860
Less accumulated amortization:		(1,755)	(384)	1,590	-	(549)
Total subscription assets, net	$	695	(384)	-	-	311

		Balance July 1, 2022	Increases	Decreases	Remeasurements	Balance June 30, 2023
Subscription assets	$	2,450	-	-	-	2,450
Less accumulated amortization:		(873)	(882)	-	-	(1,755)
Total subscription assets, net	$	1,577	(882)	-	-	695

A summary of changes in the related subscription liabilities during the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 is as follows:

		Balance July 1, 2023	Additions	Remeasurements	Deductions	Balance June 30, 2024	Amounts Due Within One Year
SBITA liabilities	$	708	-	-	(400)	308	153
Total	$	708	-	-	(400)	308	153

		Balance July 1, 2022	Additions	Remeasurements	Deductions	Balance June 30, 2023	Amounts Due Within One Year
SBITA liabilities	$	1,556	-	-	(848)	708	400
Total	$	1,556	-	-	(848)	708	400

Future annual subscription payments as of June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

Year ending June 30:		Principal amount	Interest amount	Total
2025	$	153	4	157
2026		155	2	157
		308	6	314
Less: current portion		(153)		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2024	$	155		

(Continued)

Year ending June 30:		Principal amount	Interest amount	Total
2024	$	400	8	408
2025		153	4	157
2026		155	2	157
		708	14	722
Less: current portion		(400)		
Long-term portion as of June 30, 2023	$	308		

(11) Wholesale Balancing Account

Water Supply Agreement

From 1984-2009, the Enterprise provided water service pursuant to the terms of the 1984 Water Settlement Agreement and Master Water Sales Contract, which established the basis for water rates to be charged to those customers (Wholesale Customers). The Master Water Sales Contract expired on June 30, 2009. The Commission and the Wholesale Customers approved a Water Supply Agreement (WSA) effective July 1, 2009 (the contract was most recently restated and amended in January 2023). The WSA has a 25-year term from July 1, 2009, with two options for five-year extensions. The existing 184 million gallons per day (mgd) Supply Assurance continues under the WSA and no increase in the Supply Assurance will be considered before December 31, 2028. During the period from 2009 to 2028, the WSA limits the quantity of water delivered to Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers from the watersheds to 265 mgd. Under the WSA, annual operating expenses, including debt service on bonds sold to finance regional system improvements and regional capital projects funded from revenues, will be allocated between Retail Customers and Wholesale Customers on the basis of proportionate annual water use. The original WSA stated the Wholesale Customers' share of net book value of existing regional assets as of June 30, 2009 would be recovered on level annual payment over the 25-year term of the WSA at an interest rate of 5.13%. The 25-year term repayment obligation was settled in February 2013. The Wholesale Customers made an early repayment to the Enterprise of the outstanding balance of $356,139 as allowed by Section 5.03 of the WSA. The WSA continues much of the rate setting, accounting, and dispute resolution provisions contained in the expired contract, and has emergency and drought-pricing adjustment provisions.

Pursuant to the terms of the WSA, the Enterprise is required to establish water rates applicable to the Wholesale Customers annually. The wholesale water rates are based on an estimate of the level of revenues necessary to recoup the cost of distributing water to the Wholesale Customers in accordance with the methodology outlined in Article V of the WSA (the Wholesale Revenue Requirement (WRR)). During fiscal years ending in 2024 and 2023, the WRR, net of adjustments, charged to such wholesale customers was $334,261 and $300,502, respectively. Such amounts are subject to final review by the Wholesale Customers, along with a trailing wholesale balancing account compliance audit of the WRR calculation.

Pursuant to Article VII, Section 7.02 of the WSA, the Enterprise is required to re-compute the WRR after the close of each fiscal year based on the actual costs incurred in the delivery of water to the Wholesale Customers. The difference between the wholesale revenues earned during the year and the "actual" WRR is recorded in a separate account (the Balancing Account) and represents the cumulative amount that is either owed to the Wholesale Customers (if the wholesale revenues exceed the WRR) or owed to the City (if the WRR exceeds the wholesale revenues paid). In accordance with Article VI of the WSA, the amount recorded in the Balancing Account shall earn interest at a rate equal to the average rate received by the City during the year on the invested pooled funds of the City

(Continued)

Treasury and shall be taken into consideration in the determination of subsequent wholesale water rates. The Wholesale Customers owed the Enterprise $26,121 as of June 30, 2024. The Wholesale Customers owed the Enterprise $10,052 as of June 30, 2023. Refer to the compliance audit report for the final balancing account available at https://sfpuc.gov/about-us/reports/audited-financial-statements-annual-financial-reports.

(12) Employee Benefits

(a) Pension Plan

The Enterprise participates in a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit pension Plan (SFERS Plan). For purposes of measuring the net pension liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to pensions, pension expense, information about the fiduciary net position of the SFERS Plan, and additions to/deductions from the SFERS Plan's fiduciary net position have been determined on the same basis as they are reported by the SFERS Plan. Contributions are recognized in the period in which they are due pursuant to legal requirements. Benefit payments (including refunds of employee contributions) are recognized when currently due and payable in accordance with the benefit terms. Investments are reported at fair value.

Replacement Benefits Plan – Replacement Benefits Plan (RBP) is a qualified excess benefit plan established in October 1989. Internal Revenue Code Section 415(m) provides for excess benefit arrangements that legally permit benefit payments above the Section 415 limits, provided that the payments are not paid from the SFERS Plan. The RBP allows the City to pay SFERS retirees any portion of the Charter-mandated retirement allowance that exceeds the annual Section 415(b) limit. The RBP plan does not meet the criteria of a qualified trust under GASB Statement No. 73 because RBP assets are subject to the claims of the employer's general creditors under federal and state law in the event of insolvency.

GASB Statements No. 68 and 73 require that the SFERS Plan and RBP reported results must pertain to liability and asset information within certain defined timeframes. For this report, the following timeframes are used:

Fiscal Year 2024	
Valuation Date (VD)	July 1, 2022 updated to June 30, 2023
Measurement Date (MD)	June 30, 2023
Measurement Period (MP)	July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023
Fiscal Year 2023	
Valuation Date (VD)	July 1, 2021 updated to June 30, 2022
Measurement Date (MD)	June 30, 2022
Measurement Period (MP)	July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

The City is an employer of the plan with a proportionate share of 94.85% as of June 30, 2023 (measurement date), and 94.87% as of June 30, 2022 (measurement date), 0.02% decrease from prior year. The Enterprise's allocation percentage was determined based on the Enterprise's employer contributions divided by the City's total employer contributions for fiscal years 2023 and 2022. The Enterprise's net pension liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to pensions, amortization of deferred outflows/inflows, and pension expense is based on the Enterprise's allocated percentage. The Enterprise's allocation of the City's proportionate share was 4.34% as of June 30, 2023, and 4.27% as of June 30, 2022 (measurement dates).

(Continued)

Replacement Benefits Plan – The Enterprise's allocation percentage was determined based on the Enterprise's total pension liability divided by the City's total headcount for fiscal year 2023. The Enterprise's total pension liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to pensions, amortization of deferred outflows/inflows and pension expense is based on the Enterprise's allocated percentage. The Enterprise's allocation of the City's proportionate share was 1.95% as of June 30, 2023, and 2.31% as of June 30, 2022 (measurement dates).

SFERS Plan Description – The Plan provides basic service retirement, disability, and death benefits based on specified percentages of defined final average monthly salary and provides annual cost-of-living adjustments after retirement. The Plan also provides pension continuation benefits to qualified survivors. The San Francisco City and County Charter and the Administrative Code are the authorities which establish and amend the benefit provisions and employer obligations of the Plan. The Retirement System issues a publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information for the Plan. That report may be obtained on the Retirement System's website at https://mysfers.org or by writing to the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, 1145 Market Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 or by calling (415) 487-7000.

SFERS Benefits – The Retirement System provides service retirement, disability and death benefits based on specified percentages of defined final average monthly salary and annual cost of living adjustments (COLA) after retirement. Benefits and refunds are recognized when due and payable in accordance with the terms of the Plan. The Retirement System pays benefits according to the category of employment and the type of benefit coverage provided by the City and County. The four main categories of Plan members are:

a) Miscellaneous Non-Safety Members – staff, operational, supervisory, and all other eligible employees who are not in special membership categories.
b) Sheriff's Department and Miscellaneous Safety Members – sheriffs assuming office on and after January 7, 2012, and undersheriffs, deputized personnel of the sheriff's department, and miscellaneous safety employees hired on and after January 7, 2012.
c) Firefighter Members – firefighters and other employees whose principal duties are in fire prevention and suppression work or who occupy positions designated by law as firefighter member positions.
d) Police Members – police officers and other employees whose principal duties are in active law enforcement or who occupy positions designated by law as police member positions.

The membership groups and the related service retirement benefits are included in the Notes to the Financial Statements of San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

All members are eligible to apply for a disability retirement benefit, regardless of age, when they have 10 or more years of credited service and they sustain an injury or illness that prevents them from performing their duties. Safety members are eligible to apply for an industrial disability retirement benefit from their first day on the job if their disability is caused by an illness or injury that they receive while performing their duties.

All retired members receive a benefit adjustment each July 1, which is the Basic COLA. The majority of adjustments are determined by changes in CPI with increases capped at 2%. The Plan provides for a Supplemental COLA in years when there are sufficient "excess" investment earnings in the Plan. The maximum benefit adjustment each July 1 is 3.5% including the Basic COLA. Proposition A passed on November 8, 2022 making members who retired before November 6, 1996 (Pre96 Retirees) eligible for a Supplemental COLA, even if SFERS is not fully

(Continued)

funded based on the market value of assets. Also, Pre96 Retirees' base retirement allowances were adjusted to account for Supplemental COLAs not received in 2013, 2014, 2017, 2018, and 2019 due to the full funding requirement. Effective with Proposition A, Pre96 Retirees receive the same Supplemental COLAs as the after November 6, 1996 and before January 7, 2012 members. For all members hired before January 7, 2012, all Supplemental COLAs paid to them in retirement benefits will continue into the future even where an additional Supplemental COLA is not payable in any given year. For members hired on and after January 7, 2012, a Supplemental COLA will only be paid to retirees when the Plan is fully funded on a market value of asset basis and in addition for these members, Supplemental COLAs will not be permanent adjustments to retirement benefits. That is, in years when a Supplemental COLA is not paid, all previously paid Supplemental COLAs will expire.

Funding and Contribution Policy

SFERS Plan – Contributions are made by both the City and the participating employees. Employee contributions are mandatory as required by the Charter. Employee contribution rates varied from 7.5% to 11.5% as a percentage of gross covered salary in fiscal year 2024, and 7.5% to 12.0% in fiscal year 2023. Most employee groups agreed through collective bargaining for employees to contribute the full amount of the employee contributions on a pretax basis. The City is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate. Based on the July 1, 2022 actuarial report, the required employer contribution rates for fiscal year 2024 range from 15.24% to 18.24%. Based on the July 1, 2021 actuarial report, the required employer contribution rates for fiscal year 2023 range from 17.85% to 21.35%.

Employer contributions and employee contributions made by the employer to the Plan are recognized when due and the employer has made a formal commitment to provide the contributions. The City's proportionate share of employer contributions recognized by the Retirement System in fiscal year ended June 30, 2023 and 2022 (measurement period) were $638,003 and $729,578, respectively. The Enterprise's allocation of employer contributions for fiscal years 2023 and 2022 (measurement period) was $27,925 and $31,151, respectively.

Replacement Benefits Plan – The RBP is and will remain unfunded and the rights of any participant and beneficiary are limited to those specified in the RBP. The RBP constitutes an unsecured promise by the City to make benefit payments in the future to the extent funded by the City. The City paid $4,614 replacement benefits in the year ended June 30, 2024.

Pension Liabilities/(Asset), Pension Expenses, and Deferred Outflows and Inflows of Resources Related to Pensions

Fiscal Year 2024

As of June 30, 2024, the City reported net pension liability (NPL) for its proportionate share of the net pension liability of the SFERS Plan and total pension liability of RBP of $3,588,819. The City's NPL for each of its cost-sharing plans is measured as a proportionate share of the plans' net pension liability. The net pension liability of the SFERS Plan is measured as of June 30, 2023 (measurement date), and the total pension liability for the SFERS Plan and RBP used to calculate the net pension liability was determined by an actuarial valuation as of July 1, 2022 rolled forward to June 30, 2023 using standard update procedures. The City's proportion of the net pension liability for the SFERS Plan was based on a projection of the City's long-term share of contributions to the pension plan relative to the projected contributions of all participating employers, actuarially determined. The Enterprise's allocation of the City's proportionate share

of the net pension liability for the SFERS Plan as of June 30, 2024 (reporting year) was $150,060. The Enterprise's allocation of total pension liability for the RBP as of June 30, 2024 was $2,583.

For the year ended June 30, 2024, the City's recognized pension expense was $667,276 including amortization of deferred outflow/inflow related pension items. The Enterprise's allocation of pension expense including amortization of deferred outflow/inflow related pension items was $26,330. Pension expense increased from the prior year, largely due to the amortization of deferrals.

As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise reported deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions from the following sources:

Fiscal Year 2024 Schedule of Deferred Outflows and Inflows of Resources

	SFERS Plan		Replacement Benefits Plan	
	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Pension contribution subsequent to measurement date	$ 27,653	—	—	—
Differences between expected and actual experience	16,124	—	222	657
Changes in assumptions	19,421	8,861	202	532
Net difference between projected and actual earnings on pension plan investments	28,399	—	—	—
Change in employer's proportion	1,033	2,262	472	993
Total	$ 92,630	11,123	896	2,182

Amounts reported as deferred outflows, exclusive of contributions made after the measurement date, and deferred inflows of resources will be amortized annually and recognized in pension expense (benefit) as follows:

Fiscal Years		SFERS Plan	Replacement Benefits Plan
2025	$	(340)	(366)
2026		(9,299)	(550)
2027		55,297	(384)
2028		8,196	14
Total	$	53,854	(1,286)

On June 30, 2024, the Enterprise reported $27,653 as deferred outflows of resources related to contributions subsequent to the measurement date, which will be recognized as an adjustment to net pension liability in the reporting year ending June 30, 2025.

Fiscal Year 2023

As of June 30, 2023, the City reported net pension liability (NPL) for its proportionate share of the net pension liability of the SFERS Plan and net pension liability of RBP of $2,708,927. The City's NPL/net pension assets (NPA) for each of its cost-sharing plans is measured as a proportionate share of the plans' net pension liability. The net pension liability of the SFERS Plan is measured as of June 30, 2022 (measurement date), and the total pension liability for the SFERS Plan and RBP used to calculate the net pension liability was determined by an actuarial valuation as of July 1, 2021 rolled forward to June 30, 2022 using standard update procedures. The City's proportion of the net pension liability for the SFERS Plan was based on a projection of the City's long-term share of contributions to the pension plan relative to the projected contributions of all participating employers, actuarially determined. The Enterprise's allocation of the City's proportionate share of the net pension liability for the SFERS Plan as of June 30,

(Continued)

2023 (reporting year) was $111,743. The Enterprise's allocation of total pension liability for the RBP as of June 30, 2023 was $3,600.

For the year ended June 30, 2023, the City's recognized pension expense was $1,771 including amortization of deferred outflow/inflow related pension items. The Enterprise's allocation of pension expense including amortization of deferred outflow/inflow related pension items was $6,225. Pension expense increased from the prior year, largely due to the amortization of deferrals.

As of June 30, 2023, the Enterprise reported deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions from the following sources:

Fiscal Year 2023 Schedule of Deferred Outflows and Inflows of Resources

	SFERS Plan		Replacement Benefits Plan	
	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Pension contribution subsequent to measurement date	$ 27,925	—	—	—
Differences between expected and actual experience	10,200	—	475	455
Changes in assumptions	29,035	8,713	579	778
Net difference between projected and actual earnings on pension plan investments	—	13,890	—	—
Change in employer's proportion	1,869	3,138	18	1,530
Total	$ 69,029	25,741	1,072	2,763

Amounts reported as deferred outflows, exclusive of contributions made after the measurement date, and deferred inflows of resources will be amortized annually and recognized in pension/(benefits) as follows:

Fiscal Years		SFERS Plan	Replacement Benefits Plan
2024	$	(5,899)	(283)
2025		(8,602)	(374)
2026		(17,636)	(589)
2027		47,500	(445)
Total	$	15,363	(1,691)

Actuarial Assumptions

Fiscal Year 2024

A summary of the actuarial assumptions and methods used to calculate the Total Pension Liability for both SFERS Plan and RBP as of June 30, 2023 (measurement year) is provided below, including any assumptions that differ from those used in the July 1, 2022 actuarial valuation. Refer to the July 1, 2022 actuarial valuation report for a complete description of all other assumptions, which can be found on the Retirement System's website http://mysfers.org.

(Continued)

Key Actuarial Assumptions	SFERS Plan
Valuation Date	July 1, 2022 updated to June 30, 2023
Measurement Date	June 30, 2023
Actuarial Cost Method	Entry-Age Normal Cost
Expected Rate of Return	7.20% net of investment expenses
Municipal Bond Yield	3.65% as of June 30, 2023
	3.54% as of June 30, 2022
	Bond Buyer 20-Bond GO Index, June 30, 2022 and June 30, 2023
Inflation	2.50%
Projected Salary Increases	3.25% plus merit component based employee classification and years of service
Discount Rate	7.20% as of June 30, 2023
	7.20% as of June 30, 2022
Administrative Expenses	0.60% of payroll as of June 30, 2023
	0.60% of payroll as of June 30, 2022

Basic COLA	Old Miscellaneous and All New Plans	Old Police & Fire, pre 7/1/75	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.595 and A8.596	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.559 and A8.585
June 30, 2023	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%
June 30, 2022	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%

Changes of Assumptions SFERS plan – There were no changes in the discount rate for the measurement period ended June 30, 2023. The municipal bond yield increased from 3.54% to 3.65%.

Changes of Assumptions Replacement Benefits Plan – Both discount rate for the measurement period ended June 30, 2023 and the municipal bond yield increased from 3.54% to 3.65%.

Mortality rates for health Miscellaneous members were based upon adjusted PubG-2010 Employee and Retiree tables for non-annuitants and retirees, respectively. Mortality rates were then projected generationally from the base year using the MP-2019 projection scale.

The actuarial assumptions used at the June 30, 2023 measurement date were based upon the result of a demographic experience study for the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019 and an economic experience study as of July 1, 2022.

Fiscal Year 2023

A summary of the actuarial assumptions and methods used to calculate the Total Pension Liability for both SFERS Plan and RBP as of June 30, 2022 (measurement year) is provided below, including any assumptions that differ from those used in the July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation. Refer to the July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation report for a complete description of all other assumptions, which can be found on the Retirement System's website http://mysfers.org.

(Continued)

Key Actuarial Assumptions	SFERS Plan
Valuation Date	July 1, 2021 updated to June 30, 2022
Measurement Date	June 30, 2022
Actuarial Cost Method	Entry-Age Normal Cost
Expected Rate of Return	7.20% net of investment expenses
Municipal Bond Yield	3.54% as of June 30, 2022
	2.16% as of June 30, 2021
	Bond Buyer 20-Bond GO Index, June 30, 2022
Inflation	2.50%
Projected Salary Increases	3.25% plus merit component based employee classification and years of service
Discount Rate	7.20% as of June 30, 2022
	7.40% as of June 30, 2021
Administrative Expenses	0.60% of payroll as of June 30, 2022
	0.60% of payroll as of June 30, 2021

Basic COLA	Old Miscellaneous and All New Plans	Old Police & Fire, pre 7/1/75	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.595 and A8.596	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.559 and A8.585
June 30, 2022	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%
June 30, 2021	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%

Key Actuarial Assumptions	Replacement Benefits Plan
Valuation Date	July 1, 2021 updated to June 30, 2022
Measurement Date	June 30, 2022
Actuarial Cost Method	Entry-Age Normal Cost
Municipal Bond Yield	3.54% as of June 30, 2022
	Bond Buyer 20-Bond GO Index, June 24, 2021 and June 30, 2022
Inflation	2.50%
Projected Salary Increases	3.25% plus merit component based employee classification and years of service
Discount Rate	3.54% as of June 30, 2022
Administrative Expenses	0.60% of payroll as of June 30, 2022

Basic COLA	Old Miscellaneous and All New Plans	Old Police & Fire, pre 7/1/75	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.595 and A8.596	Old Police & Fire Charters A8.559 and A8.585
June 30, 2022	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%
June 30, 2021	2.00%	1.90%	2.50%	3.60%

Mortality rates for health Miscellaneous members were based upon adjusted PubG-2010 Employee and Retiree tables for non-annuitants and retirees, respectively. Mortality rates were then projected generationally from the base year using the MP-2019 projection scale.

The actuarial assumptions used at the June 30, 2021 measurement date were based upon the result of a demographic experience study for the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019 and an economic experience study as of July 1, 2021.

Discount Rate

Fiscal Year 2024

SFERS Plan – The beginning and end of year measurements are based on different assumptions and contribution methods that may result in different discount rates. The discount

rate was 7.20% as of June 30, 2023 (measurement date) and 7.20% June 30, 2022 (measurement date).

The discount rate used to measure the Total Pension Liability as of June 30, 2023 was 7.20%. The projection of cash flows used to determine the discount rate assumed that plan member contributions will continue to be made at the rates specified in the Charter. Employer contributions were assumed to be made in accordance with the contribution policy in effect for July 1, 2022 actuarial valuation. That policy includes contributions equal to the employer portion of the entry age normal costs for members as of the valuation date, a payment for the expected administrative expenses, and an amortization payment on the unfunded actuarial liability.

The amortization payment is based on closed periods that vary in length depending on the source. Charter amendments prior to July 1, 2014 are amortized over 20 years. After July 1, 2014, any Charter changes to active member benefits are amortized over 15 years and changes to inactive member benefits, including Supplemental COLAs, are amortized over 5 years. However, the change due to Proposition A was amortized over 10 years. In the July 1, 2016 valuation, the increase in the unfunded actuarial liability attributable to the Supplemental COLAs granted effective July 1, 2013 was amortized over 17 years. For the July 1, 2021 valuation, all amortization periods for actuarial gains and losses and prior assumption changes were reduced to 5 years. The assumption change effective July 1, 2021 is amortized over 20 years. Future experience gains and losses and assumption or method changes on or after July 1, 2021 are amortized over 20 years. If the plan becomes 100% funded based on the actuarial value of assets, any new net surpluses are amortized over a rolling 20-year period. All amortization schedules are established as a level percentage of payroll so payments increase 3.25% each year. The unfunded actuarial liability is based on an actuarial value of assets that smooths investment gains and losses over five years and a measurement of the actuarial liability that excludes the value of any future Supplemental COLAs.

While the contributions and measure of actuarial liability in the funding valuation do not anticipate any future Supplemental COLAs, the projected contributions for the determination of the discount rate include the anticipated future amortization payments on future Supplemental COLAs for current members when they are expected to be granted. For members who were hired before Proposition C passed, a Supplemental COLA is granted if the actual investment earnings during the year exceed the expected investment earnings on the actuarial value of assets. For members who were hired after Proposition C passed, the market value of assets must also exceed the actuarial liability for a Supplemental COLA to be granted. When a Supplemental COLA is granted, the amount depends on the amount of excess earnings and the basic COLA amount for each membership group. Most members receive a 1.50% Supplemental COLA when a full Supplemental COLA is granted.

No Supplemental COLA was payable as of July 1, 2023 due to the unfavorable investment return for fiscal year 2023. The table below shows the net assumed Supplemental COLA for members with a 2.00% Basic COLA for sample years.

Assumed Supplemental COLA for Members with a 2.00% Basic COLA

Fiscal Years	96 - Prop C	Before 11/6/96 or After Prop C
2025+	0.75 %	0.50 %

The projection of benefit payments to current members for determining the discount rate includes the payment of anticipated future Supplemental COLAs.

(Continued)

Based on these assumptions, the Retirement System's fiduciary net position was projected to be available to make projected future benefit payments for current members through 2104. Projected benefit payments are discounted at the long-term expected return on assets of 7.20% to the extent the fiduciary net position is available to make the payments and at the municipal bond rate of 3.65% to the extent they are not available. The single equivalent rate used to determine the Total Pension Liability as of June 30, 2023 is 7.20%.

The long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was 7.20%. It was set by the Retirement Board after consideration of both expected future returns and historical returns experienced by the Retirement System. Expected future returns were determined by using a building-block method in which best-estimate ranges of expected future real rates of return were developed for each major asset class. These ranges were combined to produce the long-term expected rate of return by weighting the expected future real rates of return by the target asset allocation percentage and by adding expected inflation. Target allocation and best estimates of geometric long-term expected real rates of return (net of pension plan investment expense and inflation) for each major asset class are summarized in the following table.

Asset Class	Target Allocations	Long-Term Expected Real Rate of Return
Global Equity	37.0 %	4.6 %
Private Equity	23.0	7.8
Private Credit	10.0	5.8
Real Assets	10.0	5.3
Absolute Return	10.0	4.4
Treasuries	8.0	1.7
Liquid Credit	5.0	3.5
Leverage	-3.0	1.4
Total	100.0	

Replacement Benefits Plan – The beginning and end of year measurements are based on different assumptions that result in different discount rates. The discount rate was 3.65% as of June 30, 2023. This reflects the yield for a 20-year, tax-exempt general obligation municipal bond with an average rating of AA/Aa or higher. The Municipal Bond Yields are the Bond Buyer 20-Year GO Index as of June 30, 2022 and June 29, 2023. These are the rates used to determine the total pension liability as of June 30, 2023.

The inflation assumption of 2.50% compounded annually was used for projecting the annual IRC Section 415(b) limitations. The actual IRC Section 415(b) limitations published by the IRS of $265 was used for the 2023 measurement date.

The SFERS assumptions about Basic and Supplemental COLA previously discussed also apply to the Replacement Benefits Plan, including the impact of the State Appeals Court determination that the full funding requirement for payment of Supplemental COLA included in Proposition C was unconstitutional and the impact is accounted for as a change in benefits.

On June 30, 2024, City's membership in the RBP had a total of 227 active members and 149 retirees and beneficiaries currently receiving benefits. The Enterprise has 6 active members and 4 retirees and beneficiary currently receiving benefits.

Fiscal Year 2023

SFERS Plan – The beginning and end of year measurements are based on different assumptions and contribution methods that may result in different discount rates. The discount rate was 7.20% as of June 30, 2022 (measurement date) and 7.40% June 30, 2021 (measurement date).

The discount rate used to measure the Total Pension Liability as of June 30, 2022 was 7.20%. The projection of cash flows used to determine the discount rate assumed that plan member contributions will continue to be made at the rates specified in the Charter. Employer contributions were assumed to be made in accordance with the contribution policy in effect for July 1, 2021 actuarial valuation. That policy includes contributions equal to the employer portion of the entry age normal costs for members as of the valuation date, a payment for the expected administrative expenses, and an amortization payment on the unfunded actuarial liability.

The amortization payment is based on closed periods that vary in length depending on the source. Charter amendments prior to July 1, 2014 are amortized over 20 years. After July 1, 2014, any Charter changes to active member benefits are amortized over 15 years and changes to inactive member benefits, including Supplemental COLAs, are amortized over 5 years. The remaining unfunded actuarial liability not attributable to Charter amendments as of July 1, 2013 is amortized over a 19-year period commencing July 1, 2014. Experience gains and losses and assumption or method changes on or after July 1, 2014 are amortized over 20 years. The full amortization payment for the 2015 assumption changes is phased in over a period of 5 years. For the July 1, 2016 valuation, the increase in the unfunded actuarial liability attributable to the Supplemental COLAs granted on July 1, 2013 and July 1, 2014 are amortized over 17-years and 5-years respectively. All amortization schedules are established as a level percentage of payroll so payments increase 3.25% each year. The unfunded actuarial liability is based on an actuarial value of assets that smooths investment gains and losses over five years and a measurement of the actuarial liability that excludes the value of any future Supplemental COLAs.

While the contributions and measure of actuarial liability in the funding valuation do not anticipate any future Supplemental COLAs, the projected contributions for the determination of the discount rate include the anticipated future amortization payments on future Supplemental COLAs for current members when they are expected to be granted. For members who worked after November 6, 1996 and before Proposition C passed (Post 97 Retirees), a Supplemental COLA is granted if the actual investment earnings during the year exceed the expected investment earnings on the actuarial value of assets. For members who did not work after November 6, 1996 and before Proposition C passed, the market value of assets must also exceed the actuarial liability at the beginning of the year for a Supplemental COLA to be granted. When a Supplemental COLA is granted, the amount depends on the amount of excess earnings and the basic COLA amount for each membership group. The large majority of members receive a 1.50% supplemental COLA when granted.

Because the probability of a Supplemental COLA depends on the current funded level of the Retirement System for certain members, an assumption was developed as of June 30, 2022 for the probability and amount of Supplemental COLA for each future year. A full Supplemental COLA will be paid to all retired members, and their beneficiaries, who were retired effective July 1, 2022. The table below shows the net assumed Supplemental COLA for members with a 2.00% Basic COLA for sample years.

(Continued)

Assumed Supplemental COLA for Members with a 2.00% Basic COLA

Fiscal Years	96 - Prop C	Before 11/6/96 or After Prop C
2024	0.75 %	0.70 %
2025	0.75	0.60
2026	0.75	0.60
2027+	0.75	0.50

The projection of benefit payments to current members for determining the discount rate includes the payment of anticipated future Supplemental COLAs.

Based on these assumptions, the Retirement System's fiduciary net position was projected to be available to make projected future benefit payments for current members for all future years. Projected benefit payments are discounted at the long-term expected return on assets of 7.20% to the extent the fiduciary net position is available to make the payments and at the municipal bond rate of 3.54% to the extent they are not available. The single equivalent rate used to determine the Total Pension Liability as of June 30, 2022 is 7.20%.

The long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was 7.20%. It was set by the Retirement Board after consideration of both expected future returns and historical returns experienced by the Retirement System. Expected future returns were determined by using a building-block method in which best-estimate ranges of expected future real rates of return were developed for each major asset class. These ranges were combined to produce the long-term expected rate of return by weighting the expected future real rates of return by the target asset allocation percentage and by adding expected inflation. Target allocation and best estimates of geometric long-term expected real rates of return (net of pension plan investment expense and inflation) for each major asset class are summarized in the following table.

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Long-Term Expected Real Rate of Return
Global Equity	37.0 %	4.8 %
Private Equity	23.0	7.9
Private Credit	10.0	5.8
Real Assets	10.0	4.7
Hedge Funds/Absolute Return	10.0	3.4
Treasuries	8.0	0.6
Liquid Credit	5.0	3.5
Leverage	-3.0	0.6
Total	100.0	

Replacement Benefits Plan – The beginning and end of year measurements are based on different assumptions that result in different discount rates. The discount rate was 3.54% as of June 30, 2022. This reflects the yield for a 20-year, tax-exempt general obligation municipal bond with an average rating of AA/Aa or higher. The Municipal Bond Yields are the Bond Buyer 20-Year GO Index as of June 30, 2022. This is the rate used to determine the total pension liability as of June 30, 2022.

The inflation assumption of 2.50% compounded annually was used for projecting the annual IRC Section 415(b) limitations. The actual IRC Section 415(b) limitations published by the IRS of $245 was used for the 2022 measurement date.

(Continued)

The SFERS assumptions about Basic and Supplemental COLA previously discussed also apply to the Replacement Benefits Plan, including the impact of the State Appeals Court determination that the full funding requirement for payment of Supplemental COLA included in Proposition C was unconstitutional and the impact is accounted for as a change in benefits.

On June 30, 2023, City's membership in the RBP had a total of 327 active members and 160 retirees and beneficiaries currently receiving benefits. The Enterprise has 7 active members and 6 retirees and beneficiary currently receiving benefits.

Sensitivity of Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability (NPL) to Changes in the Discount Rate – The following presents the Enterprise's allocation of the employer's proportionate share of the net pension liability/(asset) for the SFERS Plan, calculated using the discount rate, as well as what the Enterprise's allocation of the employer's proportionate share of the net pension liability/(asset) would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1% lower or 1% higher than the current rate.

Fiscal Year 2024

Employer	1% Decrease Share of NPL @ 6.20%	Share of NPL @ 7.20%	1% Increase Share of (NPA) @ 8.20%
Water	$ 351,972	150,060	(16,414)

Fiscal Year 2023

Employer	1% Decrease Share of NPL @ 6.20%	Share of NPL @ 7.20%	1% Increase Share of (NPA) @ 8.20%
Water	$ 305,993	111,743	(48,394)

The allocation of the employer's proportionate share of the total pension liability for the Replacement Benefits Plan, calculated using the discount rate, as well as what the Enterprise's allocation of the employer's proportionate share of the total pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1% lower or 1% higher than the current rate.

Fiscal Year 2024

Employer	1% Decrease @ 2.65%	Measurment Date @ 3.65%	1% Increase @ 4.65%
Water	$ 3,060	2,583	2,207

Fiscal Year 2023

Employer	1% Decrease @ 2.54%	Measurment Date @ 3.54%	1% Increase @ 4.54%
Water	$ 4,270	3,600	3,072

(b) Other Postemployment Benefits

The Enterprise participates in a single-employer defined benefit other postemployment benefits plan (the Plan). The Plan is maintained by the City and is administered through the City's Health Service System. It provides postemployment medical, dental and vision insurance benefits to eligible employees, retired employees, surviving spouses, and domestic partners. Health benefit provisions are established and may be amended through negotiations between the City and the respective bargaining units. The City does not issue a separate report on its other postemployment benefit plan.

GASB Statement No. 75 requires that reported results must pertain to liability and asset information within certain defined timeframes. For this report, the following timeframes are used.

San Francisco Health Service System Retiree Plan - Single-Employer

Fiscal year 2024	
Valuation Date (VD)	June 30, 2022 updated to June 30, 2023
Measurement Date (MD)	June 30, 2023
Measurement Period (MP)	July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023

Fiscal year 2023	
Valuation Date (VD)	June 30, 2022
Measurement Date (MD)	June 30, 2022
Measurement Period (MP)	July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

The Enterprise's proportionate share percentage of the Plan was determined based on its percentage of citywide "pay-as-you-go" contributions for the years ended June 30, 2023 and June 30, 2022. The Enterprise's net Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to OPEB, amortization of deferred outflows/inflows and OPEB expense to each department is based on the Enterprise's allocated percentage. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's OPEB elements as of June 30, 2023 and 2022 measurement dates was 4.03% and 3.97%, respectively.

Benefits

Permanent full-time and elected employees are eligible to retire and receive postemployment health insurance benefits when they are eligible for retirement benefits from the City and County of San Francisco's Retirement System. The eligibility requirements are as follows:

Normal Retirement	Miscellaneous	Age 50 with 20 years of credited service[1] Age 60 with 10 years of credited service
	Safety	Age 50 with 5 years of credited service
Disabled Retirement[2]		Any age with 10 years of credited service
Terminated Vested		5 years of credited service at separation

[1] Age 53 with 20 years of credited service, age 60 with 10 years of credited service, or age 65 for Miscellaneous members hired on or after January 7, 2012 under Charter Section 8.603.
[2] No service requirement for Safety members retiring under the industrial disability benefit or for surviving spouses / domestic partners of those killed in the line of duty.

Retiree healthcare benefits are administered by the San Francisco Health Service System and include the following:

Medical:	PPO – Blue Shield (self-insured) and UHC Medicare Advantage (fully-insured) HMO – Kaiser (fully-insured) and Blue Shield (flex-funded) and Health Net (flex-funded)
Dental:	Delta Dental, DeltaCare USA, and UnitedHealthcare Dental
Vision:	Vision benefits are provided under the medical insurance plans and are administered by Vision Service Plan.

Projections of the sharing of benefit related costs are based on an established pattern of practice.

Contributions

Benefits provided under the Plan are currently paid through "pay as you go" funding. Additionally, under the City Charter, active officers and employees of the City who commenced employment on or after January 10, 2009, shall contribute to the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund (Trust Fund) a percentage of compensation not to exceed 2% of pre-tax compensation. The City shall contribute 1% of compensation for officers and employees who commenced employment on or after January 10, 2009 until the City's GASB Actuary has determined that the City's portion of the Trust Fund is fully funded. At that time, the City's 1% contribution shall cease, and officers and employees will each contribute 50% of the maximum 2% of pre-tax compensation.

Starting July 1, 2016, active officers and employees of the City who commenced employment on or before January 9, 2009, shall contribute 0.25% of pre-tax compensation into the Trust Fund. Beginning on July 1st of each subsequent year, the active officers and employees of the City who commenced employment on or before January 9, 2009, shall contribute an additional 0.25% of pre-tax compensation up to a maximum of 1%. Starting July 1, 2016, the City shall contribute 0.25% of compensation into the Trust Fund for each officer and employee who commenced employment on or before January 9, 2009. Beginning on July 1st of each subsequent year, the City shall contribute an additional 0.25% of compensation, up to a maximum of 1% for each officer and employee who commenced employment on or before January 9, 2009. When the City's actuary has determined that the City's portion of the Trust Fund is fully funded, the City's 1% contribution shall cease, and officers and employees will each contribute 50% of the maximum 1% of pre-tax compensation.

Additional or existing contribution requirements may be established or modified by amendment to the City's Charter.

For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, funding was based on "pay-as-you-go" plus a contribution of $48,779 and $45,241 to the Retiree Healthcare Trust Fund, respectively. The "pay-as-you-go" portion paid by the City was $229,922 for a total contribution of $278,701 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024, and $215,408 for a total contribution of $260,649 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2023. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's contributions for fiscal year 2024 was $11,241, and for fiscal year 2023 was $10,339, and will be recognized as a reduction of the net OPEB liability in the subsequent fiscal period.

OPEB liabilities, OPEB Expenses and Deferred Outflows/Inflows of Resources Related to OPEB

Fiscal Year 2024

As of June 30, 2024, the City reported net OPEB liability related to the Plan of $3,924,832. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability as of June 30, 2024 was $158,301.

For the year ended June 30, 2024, the City's recognized OPEB expense was $261,158. Amortization of the City's deferred outflows and inflows is included as a component of OPEB expense. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's OPEB expense was $13,394.

(Continued)

As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise reported its proportionate share of the City's deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to OPEB from the following sources:

	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Contributions subsequent to measurement date	$ 11,241	$ -
Differences between expected and actual experience	6,801	18,351
Changes in assumptions	4,602	-
Net difference between projected and actual earnings on plan investments	1,212	-
Change in proportion	6,118	3,983
Total	**$ 29,974**	**$ 22,334**

Amounts reported as deferred outflows, exclusive of contributions made after the measurement date, and deferred inflows of resources will be amortized annually and recognized in OPEB expense as follows:

Year ending June 30:	
2025	$ (531)
2026	(459)
2027	(877)
2028	(2,223)
2029	489
Total	$ (3,601)

Fiscal Year 2023

As of June 30, 2023, the City reported net OPEB liability related to the Plan of $3,746,270. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability as of June 30, 2023 was $148,601.

For the year ended June 30, 2023, the City's recognized OPEB expense was $256,974. Amortization of the City's deferred outflows and inflows is included as a component of OPEB expense. The Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's OPEB expense was $20,381.

As of June 30, 2023, the Enterprise reported its proportionate share of the City's deferred outflows/inflows of resources related to OPEB from the following sources:

	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Contributions subsequent to measurement date	$ 10,339	$ -
Differences between expected and actual experience	3,299	24,740
Changes in assumptions	6,344	-
Net difference between projected and actual earnings on plan investments	2,392	-
Change in proportion	6,242	2,335
Total	**$ 28,616**	**$ 27,075**

(Continued)

Amounts reported as deferred outflows, exclusive of contributions made after the measurement date, and deferred inflows of resources will be amortized annually and recognized in OPEB expense as follows:

Year ending June 30:	
2024	$ (2,253)
2025	(2,213)
2026	(720)
2027	(1,132)
2028	(2,480)
Total	$ (8,798)

(Continued)

Actuarial Assumptions

Fiscal Year 2024

A summary of the actuarial assumptions and methods used to calculate the Total OPEB Liability as of June 30, 2023 (measurement date) is provided below:

Key Actuarial Assumptions

Valuation Date	June 30, 2022 updated to June 30, 2023
Measurement Date	June 30, 2023
Actuarial Cost Method	The Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method is used to measure the Plan's Total OPEB Liability
Healthcare Cost Trend Rates	Pre-Medicare trend starts at 7.24% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.94% in 2075 Medicare trend starts at 7.24% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.94% in 2075 10-County average trend starts at 5.00% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.94% in 2075 Vision and expenses trend remains a flat 3.0% for all years
Expected Rate of Return on Plan Assets	7.00%
Salary Increase Rate	Wage Inflation Component: 3.25% Additional Merit Component (dependent on years of service): Police: 0.50% - 7.50% Fire: 0.50% - 14.00% Muni Drivers: 0.00% - 16.00% Craft: 0.50% - 3.75% Misc: 0.30% - 5.50%
Inflation Rate	Wage Inflation: 3.25% compounded annually Consumer Price Inflation: 2.50% compounded annually
Mortality Tables	Base mortality tables are developed by multiplying a published table by an adjustment factor developed in SFERS experience study for the period ended June 30, 2019.

Non-Annuitants

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	0.834	0.866
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	1.011	0.979

Healthy Retirees

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	0.947	1.044

Disabled Retirees

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.045	1.003
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	0.916	0.995

Beneficiaries

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977
Safety	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977

The mortality rates in the base tables are projected generationally from the base year using the MP-2019 projection scale.

(Continued)

Fiscal Year 2023

A summary of the actuarial assumptions and methods used to calculate the Total OPEB Liability as of June 30, 2022 (measurement date) is provided below:

Key Actuarial Assumptions

Valuation Date	June 30, 2022
Measurement Date	June 30, 2022
Actuarial Cost Method	The Entry Age Actuarial Cost Method is used to measure the Plan's Total OPEB Liability
Healthcare Cost Trend Rates	Pre-Medicare trend starts at 7.74% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.93% in 2076 Medicare trend starts at 7.74% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.94% in 2076 10-County average trend starts at 5.00% trending down to ultimate rate of 3.94% in 2076 Vision and expenses trend remains a flat 3.0% for all years
Expected Rate of Return on Plan Assets	7.00%
Salary Increase Rate	Wage Inflation Component: 3.25% Additional Merit Component (dependent on years of service): Police: 0.50% - 7.50% Fire: 0.50% - 14.00% Muni Drivers: 0.00% - 16.00% Craft: 0.50% - 3.75% Misc: 0.30% - 5.50%
Inflation Rate	Wage Inflation: 3.25% compounded annually Consumer Price Inflation: 2.50% compounded annually
Mortality Tables	Base mortality tables are developed by multiplying a published table by an adjustment factor developed in SFERS experience study for the period ending June 30, 2019.

Non-Annuitants

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	0.834	0.866
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	1.011	0.979

Healthy Retirees

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	0.947	1.044

Disabled Retirees

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.045	1.003
Safety	PubS-2010 Employee	0.916	0.995

Beneficiaries

	Published Table	Adjustment Factor Male	Female
Miscellaneous	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977
Safety	PubG-2010 Employee	1.031	0.977

The mortality rates in the base tables are projected generationally from the base year using the MP-2019 projection scale.

(Continued)

Sensitivity of Liabilities to Changes in the Healthcare Cost Trend Rate and Discount Rate

The following presents the Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability calculated using the healthcare cost trend rate, as well as what the Enterprise's allocation of the City's net OPEB liability would be if it were calculated using a healthcare cost trend rate that is 1% lower or 1% higher than the current rate:

Fiscal Year 2024

Employer	-1.00%	Healthcare Cost Trend Rate	1.00%
Water	$ 134,621	$ 158,301	$ 187,684

Fiscal Year 2023

Employer	-1.00%	Healthcare Cost Trend Rate	1.00%
Water	$ 127,125	$ 148,601	$ 175,238

Discount Rate

Fiscal Year 2024

The discount rate used to measure the Total OPEB Liability as of June 30, 2023 was 7.0%. Based on the assumption that plan member contributions will continue to be made at the rates specified in the Charter, it was determined that the Plan's projected fiduciary net position will be greater than or equal to the benefit payments projected for each future period. As such, the long-term expected rate of return on plan investments was applied to all periods of projected benefit payments to determine the total OPEB liability.

The long-term expected rate of return on OPEB plan investments was 7.0% based on expected future returns and historical returns experienced by the Trust Fund. Expected future returns were determined based on 10-year and 20-year capital market assumptions for the Trust Fund's asset allocation. Target allocation for each major asset class and best estimates of geometric real rates of return are summarized in the following table:

(Continued)

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Long-term Expected Real Rate of Return
Equities		
U.S. Large Cap	25.0%	6.1%
U.S. Small Cap	2.0%	6.7%
Developed Market Equity (non-U.S.)	13.0%	7.2%
Emerging Market Equity	10.0%	7.4%
Credit		
Bank Loans	3.0%	4.4%
High Yield Bonds	3.0%	4.7%
Rate Securities		
Investment Grade Bonds	7.0%	2.8%
Short-term Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS)	5.0%	1.0%
Private Markets		
Private Equity	10.0%	8.4%
Private Debt	5.0%	6.4%
Core Private Real Estate	5.0%	3.9%
Infrastructure (Core Private)	2.0%	5.2%
Risk Mitigating Strategies		
Global Macro	10.0%	3.1%
Total	100.0%	

The following presents the Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability calculated using the discount rate, as well as what the Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1% lower or 1% higher than the current rate:

1% Decrease 6.00%	Discount Rate 7.00%	1% Increase 8.00%
$ 185,275	$ 158,301	$ 136,180

Fiscal Year 2023

The discount rate used to measure the Total OPEB Liability as of June 30, 2022 was 7.0%. Based on the assumption that plan member contributions will continue to be made at the rates specified in the Charter, it was determined that the Plan's projected fiduciary net position will be greater than or equal to the benefit payments projected for each future period. As such, the long-term expected rate of return on plan investments was applied to all periods of projected benefit payments to determine the total OPEB liability.

The long-term expected rate of return on OPEB plan investments was 7.0% based on expected future returns and historical returns experienced by the Trust Fund. Expected future returns were determined based on 10-year and 20-year capital market assumptions for the Trust Fund's asset allocation. Target allocation for each major asset class and best estimates of geometric real rates of return are summarized in the following table:

(Continued)

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Long-term Expected Real Rate of Return
Equities		
U.S. Large Cap	28.0%	6.8%
U.S. Small Cap	3.0%	7.4%
Developed Market Equity (non-U.S.)	15.0%	7.5%
Emerging Market Equity	13.0%	8.4%
Credit		
Bank Loans	3.0%	4.0%
High Yield Bonds	3.0%	4.4%
Emerging Market Bonds	3.0%	4.2%
Rate Securities		
Investment Grade Bonds	9.0%	2.4%
Long-term Government Bonds	4.0%	2.8%
Short-term Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS)	4.0%	1.9%
Private Markets		
Private Equity	5.0%	10.0%
Core Private Real Estate	5.0%	6.1%
Risk Mitigating Strategies		
Global Macro	5.0%	5.0%
Total	100.0%	

The following presents the Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability calculated using the discount rate, as well as what the Enterprise's proportionate share of the City's net OPEB liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1% lower or 1% higher than the current rate:

1% Decrease 6.00%	Discount Rate 7.00%	1% Increase 8.00%
$ 173,000	$ 148,601	$ 128,583

The City issues a publicly available financial report that includes the complete note disclosures and required supplementary information related to the City's postemployment health care obligations. The report may be obtained at https://sfrhctf.org/financial-reports or by writing to the City and County of San Francisco, Office of the Controller, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316, San Francisco, California 94102, or by calling (415) 554-7500.

(13) Related Parties

Various common costs incurred by the Commission are allocated among the Enterprise, Hetch Hetchy Water and Power and CleanPowerSF Enterprise, and the Wastewater Enterprise. The allocations are based on the Commission management's best estimate and may change from year to year depending on the activities incurred by each Enterprise and the information available. The administrative costs of $59,952 or 48.1% and $55,121 or 48.2% were allocated to the Enterprise for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively.

The City performs certain administrative services such as maintenance of accounting records and investment of cash for all fund groups within the City. The various funds are charged for these services based on the City's indirect cost allocation plan.

(Continued)

The Enterprise purchases water from Hetch Hetchy Water. The amounts, totaling $46,266 and $49,636 for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively, have been included in the services provided by other departments in the accompanying financial statements.

The Enterprise purchases electricity from Hetch Hetchy Power at market rates. The amounts, totaling $10,256 and $11,398 for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively, have been included in services provided by other departments in the accompanying financial statements.

The Enterprise sold water to the Wastewater Enterprise at retail rates. This amount, totaling $1,736 and $1,552 for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively, has been included in charges for services in the accompanying financial statements.

Since fiscal year 2008, the Enterprise has charged City departments for water usage except for fire hydrants, which are used for general public safety. In fiscal years 2024 and 2023, the Enterprise delivered water for fire hydrant purposes totaling $5 and $9, respectively, based on metered usage and applicable water rates, and the amount has been excluded from operating revenues in the accompanying financial statements.

A variety of City departments provide services such as engineering, purchasing, legal, data processing, telecommunications, and human resources to the Enterprise and charge amounts designed to recover those departments' costs. These charges, totaling $20,925 and $18,690 for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively, have been included in services provided by other departments in the accompanying financial statements.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024, the Enterprise transferred $1,167 to the Arts Commission for the arts enrichment fund, $42 to Hetch Hetchy Water to fund various Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects, and $32 to the Office of the City Administrator for the Enterprise's contribution to the Surety Bond Program. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2023, the Enterprise transferred $20,000 to Hetch Hetchy Water to fund various Mountain Tunnel Improvement projects, and $32 to the Office of the City Administrator for the Enterprise's contribution to the Surety Bond Program.

As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise had interfund receivables of $102 from DPW relating to custom work projects. As of June 30, 2023, the Enterprise had interfund receivables of $115 from DPW relating to custom work projects.

SFPUC's 75-year lease agreement with the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, for the use of parking spaces for its fleet of vehicles at the Civic Center Garage, commenced on February 1, 2011. The total payment under this agreement is $6,274, which was fully made as of fiscal year 2015. The expenses and prepayments among the three SFPUC Enterprises are based on 525 Golden Gate occupancy. As of June 30, 2024, the Enterprise's allocable shares of expenses and prepayment were $46 and $3,174, respectively; and as of June 30, 2023, the Enterprise's allocable shares of expenses and prepayment were $45 and $3,220, respectively.

The Enterprise had a $0 and $2,440 payable to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for a settlement payable relating to the Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement project as of June 30, 2024 and 2023, respectively.

(Continued)

(14) Risk Management

The Enterprise's Risk Management program includes both self-insured (i.e., self-retention) and insured exposures at risk. Risk assessments and purchasing of insurance coverage are collaboratively coordinated by SFPUC Risk Management and the City's Office of Risk Management. With certain exceptions, the City and the Enterprise's general approach is to first evaluate the exposure at risk for self-insurance. Based on this analysis, internal mitigation strategies and financing through a self-retention mechanism is generally more economical as the SFPUC in coordination with the City Attorney's Office, administers, adjusts, settles, defends, and pays claims from budgeted resources (i.e., pay-as-you-go fund). When economically more viable or when required by debt financing covenants, the Enterprise obtains commercial insurance. At least annually, the City actuarially determines general liability and workers' compensation risk exposures. The Enterprise does not maintain commercial earthquake coverage, with certain minor exceptions, such as a sub-limit for fire-sprinkler leakage due to earthquake under the SFPUC Property Insurance program. In the past three years, there were no settlements that exceeded insurance coverage.

Risk	Coverage Approach
(a) General Liability	Self-Insured
(b) Workers' Compensation	Self-Insured through Citywide Pool
(c) Property	Purchased Insurance and Self-Insured
(d) Public Officials Liability	Purchased Insurance
(e) Employment Practices Liability	Purchased Insurance
(f) Cyber Liability	Purchased Insurance
(g) Crime	Purchased Insurance
(h) Electronic Data Processing	Purchased Insurance and Self-Insured
(i) Surety Bonds	Purchased and Contractual Risk Transfer
(j) Errors and Omissions	Purchased and Contractual Risk Transfer
(k) Builders' Risk	Contractual Risk Transfer

(a) General Liability

Through coordination with the Controller's Office and the City Attorney's Office, the general liability risk exposure is actuarially determined and is addressed through pay-as-you-go funding as part of the budgetary process. Associated costs and estimates are recorded as expenses as required under GAAP for financial statement purposes for both the Enterprise and the City and County of San Francisco's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report. The claim expense allocations are determined based on actuarially determined anticipated claim payments and the projected timing of disbursement.

The changes for the general liability (damage claims) for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

Fiscal years	Beginning of year	Claims	Claims paid and changes changes in estimates	End of year
2024	$ 19,625	18,823	(15,675)	22,773
2023	36,069	1,898	(18,342)	19,625
2022	36,723	452	(1,106)	36,069

(b) Workers' Compensation

The City actuarially determines and allocates workers' compensation costs to the Enterprise according to a formula based on the following: (i) the dollar amount of claims; (ii) yearly

(Continued)

projections of payments based on historical experience; and (iii) the size of the Enterprise's payroll. The administration of workers' compensation claims and payouts are handled by the Workers' Compensation Division of the City's Department of Human Resources. Statewide workers' compensation reforms have resulted in budgetary savings in recent years. The City continues to develop and implement improved programs, such as return-to-work programs, to lower or mitigate the growth of workers' compensation costs. Programs include accident prevention, investigation, and duty modification for injured employees with medical restrictions so return to work can occur as soon as possible.

The changes in the liabilities for workers' compensation for the years ended June 30, 2024 and 2023 are as follows:

Fiscal years	Beginning of year	Claims and changes in estimates	Claims paid	End of year
2024	$ 9,735	4,336	(3,069)	11,002
2023	8,973	3,984	(3,222)	9,735
2022	8,828	2,793	(2,648)	8,973

(c) Property

The Enterprise's property risk management approach varies depending on whether the facility is currently under construction, the property is part of revenue-generating operations, the property is of high value, or is mission-critical in nature. During the course of construction, the Enterprise requires each contractor to provide its own insurance, while ensuring the full scope of work be covered with satisfactory levels to limit the Enterprise's risk exposure. Once construction is complete, the Enterprise performs an assessment to determine whether liability/loss coverage will be obtained through the commercial property policy or self-insurance. The majority of property scheduled in the insurance program is for either: (1) revenue generating facilities, (2) debt-financed facilities, (3) mandated coverage to meet statutory requirements for bonding of various public officials, or (4) high-value, mission-critical property or equipment.

(d) Public Officials Liability

All Enterprise public officials with financial oversight responsibilities are provided coverage through a commercial Public Officials Liability Policy.

(e) Employment Practices Liability

A policy is retained to protect against employment-related claims and liabilities.

(f) Cyber Liability

A policy is retained to protect against cyber-related claims and liabilities.

(g) Crime

The Enterprise also retains a Commercial Crime Policy, in lieu of bonding its employees, to provide coverage against liabilities or losses due to third-party crime or employee fraud.

(h) Electronic Data Processing

The Electronic Data Processing policy protects selected high-value electronic property in case of damage or loss.

(Continued)

(i) Surety Bonds

Bonds are required in most phases of the public utilities construction contracting process for such phases as bid, performance, and payment or maintenance. Additionally, bonds may be required in other contracts where goods or services are provided to ensure compliance with applicable terms and conditions such as warranty.

(j) Errors and Omissions

Errors and omissions, also known as Professional Liability, are commonly transferred through contract to the contracted professional, or retained through self-insurance on a case-by-case basis depending on the size, complexity, or scope of construction or professional service contracts. Examples of such contracts are inclusive of services provided by engineers, architects, design professionals, and other licensed or certified professional service providers.

(k) Builders' Risk

Builders' risk policies of insurance are required to be provided by the contractor on all construction projects for the full value of construction.

(15) Commitments and Litigation

(a) Commitments

As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the Enterprise has outstanding commitments with third parties of $248,510 and $220,706, respectively, for various capital projects and other purchase agreements for materials and services.

(b) Grants

Grants that the Enterprise receives are subject to audit and final acceptance by the granting agency. Current and prior year costs of such grants are subject to adjustment upon audit.

(c) Litigation

The Enterprise is a defendant in various legal actions and claims that arise during the normal course of business. The final disposition of those legal actions and claims is not determinable. However, in the opinion of management, the outcome of any litigation of these matters will not have a material effect on the financial position or changes in net position of the Enterprise.

(d) Environmental Issue

As of June 30, 2024 and 2023, the pollution remediation liability of $1,271 is related to the Pacific Rod & Gun Club site construction projects for the full value of construction.

(16) Subsequent Events

(a) Water Enterprise Interim Funding Program

On July 16, 2024 the SFPUC entered into an Amended and Restated Revolving Credit Agreement with U.S. Bank National Association to provide a revolving line of credit in the

(Continued)

principal amount of up to $100,000. The commitment expiration date under the Revolving Credit Agreement is July 16, 2027.

(b) Water Enterprise Interim Funding Program

On July 16, 2024 the SFPUC entered into a Second Amendment to Reimbursement Agreement, together with an Omnibus Amendment and Extension of Stated Expiration Date to the Irrevocable Letter of Credit with Barclays Bank PLC that, among other things, amends the Stated Expiration Date of the A-3 LOC to July 15, 2027.

mgo. | Certified Public Accountants

Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With *Government Auditing Standards*

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

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States (*Government Auditing Standards*), the financial statements of the San Francisco Water Enterprise (the Enterprise), an enterprise fund of the City and County of San Francisco (City), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2024, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated November 12, 2024.

Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the Enterprise's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Enterprise's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Enterprise's internal control.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified.

Report on Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Enterprise's financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the financial statements. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

Purpose of This Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the entity's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP

Walnut Creek, California
November 12, 2024



Our mission

To provide our customers with high-quality, efficient and reliable water, power and sewer services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
An Enterprise Department of the City and County of San Francisco, California

Cover photo: Calaveras Reservoir: Outlet Tower

Back cover photo: Hetch Hetchy Reservoir Waterfall

Photos by: Robin Scheswohl

Date of Publication:
November 2024

SFPUC Financial Services
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3220
sfpuc.gov

Follow Us **@MySFPUC**

APPENDIX D

PROPOSED FORMS OF OPINIONS OF BOND COUNSEL

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

[Delivery Date]

Public Utilities Commission of the
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Board of Supervisors of the
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Public Utilities Commission
of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds
2025 Series DEF

$304,505,000	**$133,480,000**
2025 Sub-Series D	**2025 Sub-Series E**
(Regional Water and Local Water)	**(Hetch Hetchy Water)**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have acted as bond counsel to the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Commission"), a commission duly constituted under the Charter (the "Charter") of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City"), in connection with the issuance by the Commission of its San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF, in the aggregate principal amount of $988,260,000, consisting, in part, of $304,505,000 principal amount of 2025 Sub-Series D (Regional Water and Local Water) (the "2025 Sub-Series D Bonds"), and $133,480,000 principal amount of 2025 Sub-Series E (Hetch Hetchy Water) (the "2025 Sub-Series E Bonds" and, together with the 2025 Sub-Series D Bonds, the "Bonds").

The Bonds are being issued pursuant to authority granted by the Charter of the City, various ordinances adopted pursuant to Proposition E, approved by City voters on November 5, 2002, Resolution No. 25-0084, adopted by the Commission on May 27, 2025 (the "Resolution") and an Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002, by and between the Commission and U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as successor trustee (the "Trustee"), as previously amended and supplemented (the "Original Indenture"), and as further supplemented by a Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025 (the "Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture"), with respect to the 2025 Sub-Series D Bonds, and a Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025 (the "Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture"), with respect to the 2025 Sub-Series E Bonds. The Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture and the Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture, together with the Original Indenture, are referred to herein as the "Indenture."

Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the respective meanings ascribed thereto in the Indenture.

In our capacity as bond counsel, we have reviewed the Indenture, certifications of the Commission, the Trustee and others, opinions of counsel to the Commission and the Trustee, and such other documents, opinions and instruments as we have deemed necessary to render the opinions set forth herein. We have assumed, but have not verified, that the signatures on all documents, certificates and opinions that we have reviewed are genuine. In our examination, we have assumed, but have not verified, the legal capacity of all natural persons, the authenticity of all documents submitted to us as originals, the conformity to original documents of all documents submitted to us as certified or photostatic copies or by facsimile or other means of electronic transmission or which we obtained from sites on the internet, and the authenticity of the originals of such latter documents. As to facts and certain other matters and the consequences thereof relevant to the opinions expressed herein and the other statements made herein, we have relied without investigation or verification upon, and have assumed the accuracy and completeness of, certificates and

letters (including opinion letters), and oral and written statements and representations of public officials, officers and other representatives of the Commission and the City, counsel for the Commission, the City and others.

Our services as bond counsel were limited to such examination and to rendering the opinions set forth below. Furthermore, we have assumed compliance with all covenants and agreements compliance with which is necessary to assure that future actions, omissions or events will not cause the interest on the Bonds to be included in gross income for federal tax purposes. With respect to the opinions expressed herein, we call attention to the fact that the enforceability of the rights and obligations under the Bonds and the Indenture are subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, arrangement, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights, to the application of equitable principles, to the exercise of judicial discretion in appropriate cases and to the limitations on legal remedies against cities and counties in the State of California. In addition, the imposition of certain fees and charges by the Commission relating to the Enterprise is subject to the provisions of Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution.

Based upon the foregoing and subject to the limitations and qualifications herein specified, as of the date hereof, we are of the opinion, under existing law, that:

(1) The Bonds have been duly authorized, executed and delivered by, and constitute the valid and binding special limited obligations of, the Commission.

(2) The Indenture has been duly authorized, executed and delivered by, and constitutes the valid and binding obligation of, the Commission. The Indenture creates a valid pledge of the Revenues of the Enterprise and certain other amounts held by the Trustee under the Indenture to secure the payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, as and to the extent set forth in the Indenture and subject to the provisions of the Indenture permitting the application thereof for the purposes and on the terms and conditions set forth therein.

(3) The Bonds are special limited obligations of the Commission and are payable exclusively from and are secured by a pledge of the Revenues of the Enterprise and certain amounts held under the Indenture. The general fund of the City is not liable, and the credit or taxing power of the City is not pledged, for the payment of the Bonds or the interest thereon. The Commission has no taxing power. The Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of the City or of the Commission or any of its income or receipts, except the Revenues.

(4) Bonds and other parity debt of the Commission have been, and from time to time hereafter may be, issued under the Indenture which are payable from Revenues of the Enterprise on a parity basis with the Bonds.

(5) Assuming continuing compliance by the Commission with certain covenants in the Indenture, the Tax Certificate (hereafter described) and other documents pertaining to the Bonds and requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the use, expenditure and investment of proceeds of the Bonds and the timely payment of certain investment earnings to the United States, interest on the Bonds is not included in the gross income of the owners of the Bonds for purposes of federal income taxation.

(6) Interest on the Bonds is not treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of computing the federal alternative minimum tax on individuals. We express no opinion regarding the applicability of the corporate alternative minimum tax to the adjusted financial statement income of any owner of the Bonds.

(7) Interest on the Bonds is exempt from personal income tax imposed by the State of California.

Our opinion in paragraph 5 above is rendered in reliance on representations and certifications of the Commission made in a Tax Certificate dated the date hereof pertaining to the use, expenditure and investment of the proceeds of the Bonds. Except as stated in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 above, we express no opinion as to any federal or

state tax consequences of the ownership or disposition of, or the receipt or accrual of interest on, the Bonds. Further, certain requirements and procedures contained or referred to in the Indenture, the Tax Certificate or in other documents pertaining to the Bonds may be changed, and certain actions may be taken, under the circumstances and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in such documents, upon the advice or with the approving opinion of counsel nationally recognized in the area of tax-exempt obligations. We express no opinion as to the effect of any change to any document pertaining to the Bonds or of any action taken or not taken where such change is made or action is taken or not taken without our approval or in reliance upon the advice of counsel other than ourselves with respect to the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Bonds for federal income tax purposes.

The opinions expressed and the statements made herein are based on an analysis of existing laws, regulations, rulings and court decisions. Such opinions and statements may be adversely affected by actions taken or events occurring, including a change in law, regulation or ruling (or in the application or official interpretation of any law, regulation or ruling) after the date hereof. We have not undertaken to determine, or to inform any person, whether such actions are taken or such events occur, and we have no obligation to update this letter in light of such actions or events or for any other reason.

No opinion is expressed herein on the accuracy, completeness or sufficiency of the Official Statement or other offering material relating to the Bonds.

The opinions in this letter are limited to the laws of the State of California and the federal laws of the United States. The opinions in this letter are expressed solely as of the date hereof for your benefit and may not be relied upon in any manner for any purposes by any other person.

Respectfully submitted,

[Delivery Date]

Public Utilities Commission of the
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Board of Supervisors of the
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Public Utilities Commission
of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds
2025 Series DEF

$550,275,000
2025 Sub-Series F
(Refunding)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have acted as bond counsel to the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Commission"), a commission duly constituted under the Charter (the "Charter") of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City"), in connection with the issuance by the Commission of its San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF, in the aggregate principal amount of $988,260,000, consisting, in part, of $550,275,000 principal amount of 2025 Sub-Series F (Refunding) (the "Bonds").

The Bonds are being issued pursuant to authority granted by the Charter of the City, various ordinances adopted pursuant to Proposition E, approved by City voters on November 5, 2002, Resolution No. 25-0086, adopted by the Commission on May 27, 2025 (the "Resolution") and an Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002, by and between the Commission and U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as successor trustee (the "Trustee"), as previously amended and supplemented (the "Original Indenture"), and as further supplemented by a Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture, dated as of June 1, 2025 (the "Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture" and, together with the Original Indenture, the "Indenture"), by and between the Commission and the Trustee.

Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the respective meanings ascribed thereto in the Indenture.

In our capacity as bond counsel, we have reviewed the Indenture, certifications of the Commission, the Trustee and others, opinions of counsel to the Commission and the Trustee, and such other documents, opinions and instruments as we have deemed necessary to render the opinions set forth herein. We have assumed, but have not verified, that the signatures on all documents, certificates and opinions that we have reviewed are genuine. In our examination, we have assumed, but have not verified, the legal capacity of all natural persons, the authenticity of all documents submitted to us as originals, the conformity to original documents of all documents submitted to us as certified or photostatic copies or by facsimile or other means of electronic transmission or which we obtained from sites on the internet, and the authenticity of the originals of such latter documents. As to facts and certain other matters and the consequences thereof relevant to the opinions expressed herein and the other statements made herein, we have relied without investigation or verification upon, and have assumed the accuracy and completeness of, certificates and letters (including opinion letters), and oral and written statements and representations of public officials, officers and other representatives of the Commission and the City, counsel for the Commission, the City and others.

Our services as bond counsel were limited to such examination and to rendering the opinions set forth below. Furthermore, we have assumed compliance with all covenants and agreements compliance with which is necessary to

assure that future actions, omissions or events will not cause the interest on the Bonds to be included in gross income for federal tax purposes. With respect to the opinions expressed herein, we call attention to the fact that the enforceability of the rights and obligations under the Bonds and the Indenture are subject to bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, arrangement, moratorium and other similar laws affecting creditors' rights, to the application of equitable principles, to the exercise of judicial discretion in appropriate cases and to the limitations on legal remedies against cities and counties in the State of California. In addition, the imposition of certain fees and charges by the Commission relating to the Enterprise is subject to the provisions of Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution.

Based upon the foregoing and subject to the limitations and qualifications herein specified, as of the date hereof, we are of the opinion, under existing law, that:

(1) The Bonds have been duly authorized, executed and delivered by, and constitute the valid and binding special limited obligations of, the Commission.

(2) The Indenture has been duly authorized, executed and delivered by, and constitutes the valid and binding obligation of, the Commission. The Indenture creates a valid pledge of the Revenues of the Enterprise and certain other amounts held by the Trustee under the Indenture to secure the payment of the principal of and interest on the Bonds, as and to the extent set forth in the Indenture and subject to the provisions of the Indenture permitting the application thereof for the purposes and on the terms and conditions set forth therein.

(3) The Bonds are special limited obligations of the Commission and are payable exclusively from and are secured by a pledge of the Revenues of the Enterprise and certain amounts held under the Indenture. The general fund of the City is not liable, and the credit or taxing power of the City is not pledged, for the payment of the Bonds or the interest thereon. The Commission has no taxing power. The Bonds are not secured by a legal or equitable pledge of, or charge, lien or encumbrance upon, any of the property of the City or of the Commission or any of its income or receipts, except the Revenues.

(4) Bonds and other parity debt of the Commission have been, and from time to time hereafter may be, issued under the Indenture which are payable from Revenues of the Enterprise on a parity basis with the Bonds.

(5) Assuming continuing compliance by the Commission with certain covenants in the Indenture, the Tax Certificate (hereafter described) and other documents pertaining to the Bonds and requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the use, expenditure and investment of proceeds of the Bonds and the timely payment of certain investment earnings to the United States, interest on the Bonds is not included in the gross income of the owners of the Bonds for purposes of federal income taxation.

(6) Interest on the Bonds is not treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of computing the federal alternative minimum tax on individuals. We express no opinion regarding the applicability of the corporate alternative minimum tax to the adjusted financial statement income of any owner of the Bonds.

(7) Interest on the Bonds is exempt from personal income tax imposed by the State of California.

Our opinion in paragraph 5 above is rendered in reliance on representations and certifications of the Commission made in a Tax Certificate dated the date hereof pertaining to the use, expenditure and investment of the proceeds of the Bonds. Except as stated in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 above, we express no opinion as to any federal or state tax consequences of the ownership or disposition of, or the receipt or accrual of interest on, the Bonds. Further, certain requirements and procedures contained or referred to in the Indenture, the Tax Certificate or in other documents pertaining to the Bonds may be changed, and certain actions may be taken, under the circumstances and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in such documents, upon the advice or with the approving opinion of counsel nationally recognized in the area of tax-exempt obligations. We express no opinion as to the effect of any change to any document

pertaining to the Bonds or of any action taken or not taken where such change is made or action is taken or not taken without our approval or in reliance upon the advice of counsel other than ourselves with respect to the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Bonds for federal income tax purposes.

The opinions expressed and the statements made herein are based on an analysis of existing laws, regulations, rulings and court decisions. Such opinions and statements may be adversely affected by actions taken or events occurring, including a change in law, regulation or ruling (or in the application or official interpretation of any law, regulation or ruling) after the date hereof. We have not undertaken to determine, or to inform any person, whether such actions are taken or such events occur, and we have no obligation to update this letter in light of such actions or events or for any other reason.

No opinion is expressed herein on the accuracy, completeness or sufficiency of the Official Statement or other offering material relating to the Bonds.

The opinions in this letter are limited to the laws of the State of California and the federal laws of the United States. The opinions in this letter are expressed solely as of the date hereof for your benefit and may not be relied upon in any manner for any purposes by any other person.

Respectfully submitted,

APPENDIX E

FORM OF CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

$988,260,000
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF

$304,505,000	**$133,480,000**	**$550,275,000**
2025 Sub-Series D	**2025 Sub-Series E**	**2025 Sub-Series F**
(Regional Water and Local Water)	**(Hetch Hetchy Water)**	**(Refunding)**

[Closing Date]

This Continuing Disclosure Certificate (the "**Disclosure Certificate**") is executed and delivered by the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (the "**SFPUC**") in connection with the issuance of the water revenue bonds captioned above (the "**2025DEF Bonds**"). The 2025DEF Bonds are being issued pursuant to an Amended and Restated Indenture, dated as of August 1, 2002, between the SFPUC and U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as trustee (the "**Trustee**"), as amended and supplemented, including as amended and supplemented by a Fiftieth Supplemental Indenture, a Fifty-First Supplemental Indenture and a Fifty-Second Supplemental Indenture, each dated as of June 1, 2025, by and between the SFPUC and the Trustee (collectively, the "**Indenture**").

The SFPUC covenants and agrees as follows:

SECTION 1. Purpose of the Disclosure Certificate. This Disclosure Certificate is being executed and delivered by the SFPUC for the benefit of the Holders and Beneficial Owners of the 2025DEF Bonds and in order to assist the Participating Underwriters in complying with Securities and Exchange Commission (the "**S.E.C.**") Rule 15c2-12(b)(5).

SECTION 2. Definitions. In addition to the definitions set forth in the Indenture, which apply to any capitalized term used in this Disclosure Certificate unless otherwise defined in this Section 2, the following capitalized terms shall have the following meanings:

"**Annual Report**" shall mean any Annual Report provided by the SFPUC pursuant to, and as described in, Sections 3 and 4 of this Disclosure Certificate.

"**Beneficial Owner**" shall mean any person that: (a) has or shares the power, directly or indirectly, to make investment decisions concerning ownership of any 2025DEF Bonds (including persons holding 2025DEF Bonds through nominees, depositories or other intermediaries) including, but not limited to, the power to vote or consent with respect to any 2025DEF Bonds or to dispose of ownership of any 2025DEF Bonds; or (b) is treated as the owner of any 2025DEF Bonds for federal income tax purposes.

"**Dissemination Agent**" shall mean the SFPUC, acting in its capacity as Dissemination Agent under this Disclosure Certificate, or any successor Dissemination Agent designated in writing by the SFPUC and which has filed with the SFPUC a written acceptance of such designation.

"**Financial Obligation**" means, for purposes of the Listed Events set out in Section 5(a)(15) and Section (5)(a)(16), a (i) debt obligation; (ii) derivative instrument entered into in connection with, or pledged as security or a source of payment for, an existing or planned debt obligation; or (iii) guarantee of (i) or (ii). The term "Financial Obligation" shall not include municipal securities (as defined in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended) as to which a final official statement (as defined in the Rule) has been provided to the MSRB consistent with the Rule.

"**Holder**" shall mean either the registered owners of the 2025DEF Bonds, or, if the 2025DEF Bonds are registered in the name of The Depository Trust Company or another recognized depository, any applicable participant in such depository system.

"**Listed Events**" shall mean any of the events listed in Section 5(a) of this Disclosure Certificate.

"**MSRB**" shall mean the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board or any other entity designated or authorized by the Securities and Exchange Commission to receive continuing disclosure filings pursuant to the Rule. Until otherwise designated by the MSRB or the Securities and Exchange Commission, filings with the MSRB are to be made through the Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) website of the MSRB currently located at *http://emma.msrb.org*.

"**Official Statement**" shall mean the final Official Statement, dated June 5, 2025, prepared in connection with the sale and offering of the 2025DEF Bonds.

"**Participating Underwriters**" shall mean any of the original underwriters or purchasers of the 2025DEF Bonds required to comply with the Rule in connection with the offering of the 2025DEF Bonds.

"**Rule**" shall mean Rule 15c2-12(b)(5) adopted by the S.E.C. under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as the same may be amended from time to time.

SECTION 3. Provision of Annual Reports.

(a) The SFPUC shall, or shall cause the Dissemination Agent to, not later than March 31 of each year, commencing with the report for Fiscal Year 2024-25 (which is due not later than March 31, 2026), provide to the MSRB an Annual Report which is consistent with the requirements of Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate. If the Dissemination Agent is not the SFPUC, the SFPUC shall provide the Annual Report to the Dissemination Agent not later than 15 days prior to said date. The Annual Report must be submitted in electronic format and accompanied by such identifying information as is prescribed by the MSRB, and may cross-reference other information as provided in Section 4 of this Disclosure Certificate. However, if the audited financial statements of the SFPUC are not available by the date required above for the filing of the Annual Report, the SFPUC shall submit unaudited financial statements and submit the audited financial statements as soon as they are available. If the SFPUC's Fiscal Year changes, it shall give notice of such change in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(b).

(b) If the SFPUC is unable to provide to the MSRB an Annual Report by the date required in subsection (a), the SFPUC shall send a notice to the MSRB in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A.

(c) The Dissemination Agent shall (if the Dissemination Agent is other than the SFPUC) file a report with the SFPUC certifying the date that the Annual Report was provided to the MSRB pursuant to this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 4. Content of Annual Reports. The SFPUC's Annual Report shall contain or incorporate by reference the following information:

(a) Audited financial statements of the Water Enterprise for the prior Fiscal Year, prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to the SFPUC from time to time. If the SFPUC's audited financial statements are not available by the date the Annual Report is required to be filed, the Annual Report shall contain unaudited financial statements in a format similar to the financial statements contained in the final Official Statement, and the audited financial statements shall be filed in the same manner as the Annual Report when they become available;

(b) An update for the prior Fiscal Year of the table in the Official Statement entitled "TABLE 8, HISTORICAL WHOLESALE AND RETAIL WATER SALES";

(c) An update for the prior Fiscal Year of the table in the Official Statement entitled "TABLE 17, HISTORICAL AND ADOPTED PERCENTAGE INCREASES (DECREASES) IN WHOLESALE WATER RATES," provided that such update need include rate increases (decreases) through the end of the prior Fiscal Year;

(d) An update for the prior Fiscal Year of the table in the Official Statement entitled "TABLE 20, HISTORICAL AND ADOPTED PERCENTAGE INCREASES (DECREASES) IN RETAIL WATER RATES," provided that such update need include rate increases (decreases) through the end of the prior Fiscal Year;

(e) An update for the prior Fiscal Year of the table in the Official Statement in the section entitled "OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE FROM REVENUES – Outstanding Parity Revenue Bonds" showing all bonds of the SFPUC secured by Revenues; and

(f) An update for the prior Fiscal Year of the table in the Official Statement entitled "TABLE 25, HISTORICAL REVENUES, OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSES AND DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE."

Any or all of the items listed above may be set forth in a document or set of documents, or may be included by specific reference to other documents, including official statements of debt issues of the SFPUC or related public entities, which are available to the public on the MSRB website. If the document included by reference is a final official statement, it must be available from the MSRB. The SFPUC shall clearly identify each such other document so included by reference.

SECTION 5. Reporting of Significant Events.

(a) The SFPUC shall give, or cause to be given, notice of the occurrence of any of the following Listed Events with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds:

1. Principal and interest payment delinquencies;

2. Non-payment related defaults, if material;

3. Unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties;

4. Unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties;

5. Substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform;

6. Adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the Internal Revenue Service of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB) or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax status of the 2025DEF Bonds, or other material events affecting the tax status of the 2025DEF Bonds;

7. Modifications to rights of Holders, if material;

8. Optional, unscheduled or contingent bond calls, if material, and tender offers;

9. Defeasances;

10. Release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of the 2025DEF Bonds, if material;

11. Rating changes;

12. Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership or similar event of the SFPUC;

13. The consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving the SFPUC or the sale of all or substantially all of the assets of the SFPUC, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material;

14. Appointment of a successor or additional trustee or the change of name of a trustee, if material;

15. Incurrence of a Financial Obligation of the SFPUC, if material, or agreement to covenants, events of default, remedies, priority rights, or other similar terms of a Financial Obligation of the SFPUC, any of which affect Holders, if material; and

16. Default, event of acceleration, termination event, modification of terms, or other similar events under the terms of a Financial Obligation of the SFPUC, any of which reflect financial difficulties.

Note: For the purposes of the event identified in subsection (a)(12), the event is considered to occur when any of the following occur: the appointment of a receiver, fiscal agent or similar officer for the SFPUC in a proceeding under the United States Bankruptcy Code or in any other proceeding under state or federal law in which a court or governmental authority has assumed jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the SFPUC, or if such jurisdiction has been assumed by leaving the existing governing body and officials or officers in possession but subject to the supervision and orders of a court or governmental authority, or the entry of an order confirming a plan of reorganization, arrangement or liquidation by a court or governmental authority having supervision or jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the SFPUC.

(b) Whenever the SFPUC obtains knowledge of the occurrence of a Listed Event in subsection (a), the SFPUC shall, or shall cause the Dissemination Agent (if not the SFPUC) to, file a notice of such occurrence with the MSRB, in an electronic format as prescribed by the MSRB, in a timely manner not in excess of 10 business days after the occurrence of the Listed Event. Notwithstanding the foregoing, notice of a Listed Event described in subsection (a)(8) above need not be given under this subsection any earlier than the notice (if any) of the underlying event is given to holders of affected 2025DEF Bonds under the Indenture.

(c) The SFPUC intends to comply with the Listed Events described in subsection (a)(15) and subsection (a)(16) and the definition of "Financial Obligation" in Section 2, with reference to the Rule, any other applicable federal securities laws and the guidance provided by the S.E.C. in Release No. 34-83885 dated August 20, 2018 (the "**2018 Release**"), and any further amendments or written guidance provided by the S.E.C. or its staff with respect to the amendments to the Rule effected by the 2018 Release.

SECTION 6. Termination of Reporting Obligation. The SFPUC's obligations under this Disclosure Certificate shall terminate upon the legal defeasance, prior redemption or payment in full of all of the 2025DEF Bonds. If such termination occurs prior to the final maturity of the 2025DEF Bonds, the SFPUC shall give notice of such termination in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5(b).

SECTION 7. Dissemination Agent. The SFPUC may, from time to time, appoint or engage a Dissemination Agent to assist it in carrying out its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate, and may discharge any such Dissemination Agent, with or without appointing a successor Dissemination Agent. The Dissemination Agent shall have only such duties as are specifically set forth in this Disclosure Certificate.

SECTION 8. Amendment; Waiver. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the SFPUC may amend or waive this Disclosure Certificate or any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) If the amendment or waiver relates to the provisions of Sections 3(a), 3(b), 4 or 5(a), it may only be made in connection with a change in circumstances that arises from a change in legal requirements, change in law, or change in the identity, nature or status of an obligated person with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds or the type of business conducted;

(b) The undertaking, as amended or taking into account such waiver, would, in the opinion of the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco or nationally recognized bond counsel, have complied with the requirements of the Rule at the time of the original issuance of the 2025DEF Bonds, after taking into account any amendments or interpretations of the Rule, as well as any change in circumstances; and

(c) The amendment or waiver either (i) is approved by the owners of a majority in aggregate principal amount of the 2025DEF Bonds or (ii) does not, in the opinion of the City Attorney or nationally recognized bond counsel, materially impair the interests of the Holders.

In the event of any amendment or waiver of a provision of this Disclosure Certificate, the SFPUC shall describe such amendment in the next Annual Report, and shall include, as applicable, a narrative explanation of the reason for the amendment or waiver and its impact on the type (or in the case of a change of accounting principles, on the presentation) of financial information or operating data being presented by the SFPUC. In addition, if the amendment relates to the accounting principles to be followed in preparing financial statements: (i) notice of such change shall be given in the same manner as for a Listed Event under Section 5; and (ii) the Annual Report for the year in which the change is made should present a comparison (in narrative form and also, if feasible, in quantitative form) between the financial statements as prepared on the basis of the new accounting principles and those prepared on the basis of the former accounting principles.

SECTION 9. Additional Information. Nothing in this Disclosure Certificate shall be deemed to prevent the SFPUC from disseminating any other information, using the means of dissemination set forth in this Disclosure Certificate or any other means of communication, or including any other information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event, in addition to that which is required by this Disclosure Certificate. If the SFPUC chooses to include any information in any Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event in addition to that which is specifically required by this Disclosure Certificate, the SFPUC shall have no obligation under this Disclosure Certificate to update such information or include it in any future Annual Report or notice of occurrence of a Listed Event.

SECTION 10. Default. In the event of a failure of the SFPUC to comply with any provision of this Disclosure Certificate, any Participating Underwriters, Holder or Beneficial Owner of the 2025DEF Bonds may take such actions as may be necessary and appropriate, including seeking mandate or specific performance by court order, to cause the SFPUC to comply with its obligations under this Disclosure Certificate; provided that any such action may be instituted only in a federal or State court located in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. Failure by the SFPUC to comply with any provision of this Disclosure Certificate shall not be deemed an Event of Default under the Indenture and the sole remedy under this Disclosure Certificate in the event of any failure of the SFPUC to comply with this Disclosure Certificate shall be an action to compel performance.

SECTION 11. Beneficiaries. This Disclosure Certificate shall inure solely to the benefit of the SFPUC, the Dissemination Agent, the Participating Underwriters and Holders and Beneficial Owners from time to time of the 2025DEF Bonds, and shall create no rights in any other person or entity.

Dated as of the date first written above.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____
General Manager

Approved as to Form:

DAVID CHIU
CITY ATTORNEY

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

EXHIBIT A

FORM OF NOTICE TO THE
MUNICIPAL SECURITIES RULEMAKING BOARD
OF FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT

Name of Issuer:	Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
Name of Issue:	San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2025 Series DEF 2025 Sub-Series D (Regional Water and Local Water) 2025 Sub-Series E (Hetch Hetchy Water) 2025 Sub-Series F (Refunding)
Date of Issuance:	June 12, 2025

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the SFPUC has not provided an Annual Report with respect to the above-named Bonds as required by Section 3 of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, dated June 12, 2025. The SFPUC anticipates that the Annual Report will be filed by _____.

Dated: _____

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE CITY
AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: _____[to be signed only if filed]_____
Title: _____

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

APPENDIX F

SECURITIES DEPOSITORY AND THE BOOK-ENTRY SYSTEM

The information in this Appendix F has been obtained from DTC for use in securities offering documents, and the SFPUC takes no responsibility for the accuracy or completeness thereof. The SFPUC cannot and does not give any assurances that DTC, DTC Participants or Indirect Participants will distribute to the beneficial owners either (a) payments of interest, principal or premium, if any, with respect to the 2025DEF Bonds or (b) certificates representing ownership interest in or other confirmation of ownership interest in the 2025DEF Bonds, or that they will so do on a timely basis or that DTC, DTC Participants or DTC Indirect Participants will act in the manner described in this Official Statement. The current "Rules" applicable to DTC are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the current "Procedures" of DTC to be followed in dealing with DTC Participants are on file with DTC.

As used in this Appendix F, "Securities" means the 2025DEF Bonds, "Issuer" means the SFPUC, and "Agent" means the Trustee.

1. The Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), New York, NY, will act as securities depository for the securities (the "Securities"). The Securities will be issued as fully-registered securities registered in the name of Cede & Co. (DTC's partnership nominee) or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. One fully-registered Security certificate will be issued for each issue of the Securities, each in the aggregate principal amount of such issue, and will be deposited with DTC. If, however, the aggregate principal amount of any issue exceeds $500 million, one certificate will be issued with respect to each $500 million of principal amount, and an additional certificate will be issued with respect to any remaining principal amount of such issue.

2. DTC, the world's largest securities depository, is a limited-purpose trust company organized under the New York Banking Law, a "banking organization" within the meaning of the New York Banking Law, a member of the Federal Reserve System, a "clearing corporation" within the meaning of the New York Uniform Commercial Code, and a "clearing agency" registered pursuant to the provisions of Section 17A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. DTC holds and provides asset servicing for over 3.5 million issues of U.S. and non-U.S. equity issues, corporate and municipal debt issues, and money market instruments (from over 100 countries) that DTC's participants ("Direct Participants") deposit with DTC. DTC also facilitates the post-trade settlement among Direct Participants of sales and other securities transactions in deposited securities, through electronic computerized book-entry transfers and pledges between Direct Participants' accounts. This eliminates the need for physical movement of securities certificates. Direct Participants include both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, clearing corporations, and certain other organizations. DTC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation ("DTCC"). DTCC is the holding company for DTC, National Securities Clearing Corporation and Fixed Income Clearing Corporation, all of which are registered clearing agencies. DTCC is owned by the users of its regulated subsidiaries. Access to the DTC system is also available to others such as both U.S. and non-U.S. securities brokers and dealers, banks, trust companies, and clearing corporations that clear through or maintain a custodial relationship with a Direct Participant, either directly or indirectly ("Indirect Participants"). DTC has a Standard & Poor's rating of AA+. The DTC Rules applicable to its Participants are on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. More information about DTC can be found at www.dtcc.com. The information contained on this Internet site is not incorporated herein by reference.

3. Purchases of Securities under the DTC system must be made by or through Direct Participants, which will receive a credit for the Securities on DTC's records. The ownership interest of each actual purchaser of each Security ("Beneficial Owner") is in turn to be recorded on the Direct and Indirect Participants' records. Beneficial Owners will not receive written confirmation from DTC of their purchase. Beneficial Owners are, however, expected to receive written confirmations providing details of the transaction, as well as periodic statements of their holdings, from the Direct or Indirect Participant through which the Beneficial Owner entered into the transaction. Transfers of ownership interests in the Securities are to be accomplished by entries made on the books of Direct and Indirect Participants acting on behalf of Beneficial Owners. Beneficial Owners will not receive certificates representing their ownership interests in Securities, except in the event that use of the book-entry system for the Securities is discontinued.

4. To facilitate subsequent transfers, all Securities deposited by Direct Participants with DTC are registered in the name of DTC's partnership nominee, Cede & Co., or such other name as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. The deposit of Securities with DTC and their registration in the name of Cede & Co. or such other DTC nominee do not effect any change in beneficial ownership. DTC has no knowledge of the actual Beneficial Owners of the Securities; DTC's records reflect only the identity of the Direct Participants to whose accounts such Securities are credited, which may or may not be the Beneficial Owners. The Direct and Indirect Participants will remain responsible for keeping account of their holdings on behalf of their customers.

5. Conveyance of notices and other communications by DTC to Direct Participants, by Direct Participants to Indirect Participants, and by Direct Participants and Indirect Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by arrangements among them, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Beneficial Owners of Securities may wish to take certain steps to augment the transmission to them of notices of significant events with respect to the Securities, such as redemptions, tenders, defaults, and proposed amendments to the Security documents. For example, Beneficial Owners of Securities may wish to ascertain that the nominee holding the Securities for their benefit has agreed to obtain and transmit notices to Beneficial Owners. In the alternative, Beneficial Owners may wish to provide their names and addresses to the registrar and request that copies of notices be provided directly to them.

6. Redemption notices shall be sent to DTC. If less than all of the Securities within an issue are being redeemed, DTC's practice is to determine by lot the amount of the interest of each Direct Participant in such issue to be redeemed.

7. Neither DTC nor Cede & Co. (nor any other DTC nominee) will consent or vote with respect to Securities unless authorized by a Direct Participant in accordance with DTC's MMI Procedures. Under its usual procedures, DTC mails an Omnibus Proxy to Issuer as soon as possible after the record date. The Omnibus Proxy assigns Cede & Co.'s consenting or voting rights to those Direct Participants to whose accounts Securities are credited on the record date (identified in a listing attached to the Omnibus Proxy).

8. Redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments on the Securities will be made to Cede & Co., or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC. DTC's practice is to credit Direct Participants' accounts upon DTC's receipt of funds and corresponding detail information from Issuer or Agent, on payable date in accordance with their respective holdings shown on DTC's records. Payments by Participants to Beneficial Owners will be governed by standing instructions and customary practices, as is the case with securities held for the accounts of customers in bearer form or registered in "street name," and will be the responsibility of such Participant and not of DTC, Agent, or Issuer, subject to any statutory or regulatory requirements as may be in effect from time to time. Payment of redemption proceeds, distributions, and dividend payments to Cede & Co. (or such other nominee as may be requested by an authorized representative of DTC) is the responsibility of Issuer or Agent, disbursement of such payments to Direct Participants will be the responsibility of DTC, and disbursement of such payments to the Beneficial Owners will be the responsibility of Direct and Indirect Participants.

9. DTC may discontinue providing its services as depository with respect to the Securities at any time by giving reasonable notice to Issuer or Agent. Under such circumstances, in the event that a successor depository is not obtained, Security certificates are required to be printed and delivered.

10. Issuer may decide to discontinue use of the system of book-entry-only transfers through DTC (or a successor securities depository). In that event, Security certificates will be printed and delivered to DTC.

The information in this section concerning DTC and DTC's book-entry system has been obtained from sources that SFPUC believes to be reliable, but the SFPUC takes no responsibility for the accuracy thereof.

Mixed Sources
Product group from well managed forests, controlled sources and recycled wood or fibre.
Printed by: ImageMaster, LLC
www.imagemaster.com

Item 12

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: HSH Memo - Large Vehicle Legislation and Appeals Process
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 8:45:00 AM
Attachments:	7.7.2025_Appeals Process for Permit_BOS Memo.pdf Outlook-byjflw30.png

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing regarding File No. 250655, which is Item No. 13 on today's Budget and Finance Committee agenda.

> **File No. 250655:** Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor, Melgar, Mandelman, Engardio, Dorsey, Sherrill)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>; Ramos, Joel (MTA) <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Subject: HSH Memo - Large Vehicle Legislation and Appeals Process

Good afternoon,

Attached please find a memo on the Large Vehicle Legislation and Appeals Process we are respectfully requesting be distributed to the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (She/Hers)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
dylan.schneider@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: Shireen McSpadden, Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing
Julie Kirschbaum, SFMTA
Kunal Modi, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie

Date: July 7, 2025

Subject: Large Vehicle Legislation & Appeals Process

As the Budget and Finance Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors prepares to hear the Mayor's Large Vehicle legislation (FILE NO. 250655) on Wednesday July 9, 2025, we want to assure members of our collective commitment to this strategy and the development of a fair appeals process.

Supervisor Melgar has requested an amendment to the legislation that requires the City to develop and administer a fair appeals process for the eligibility or revocation of the Large Vehicle Refuge Permit program outlined in the legislation. The City is in support of this amendment and is grateful to the Supervisor for the thoughtful proposal.

We additionally want to assure members of the Board that the multi-department Large Vehicle Taskforce has been working on the development of an appeals process which will be published prior to the implementation of the Large Vehicle Refuge Permit program. The appeals process may be modeled after established procedures in other jurisdictions as well as those existing in San Francisco, such as the SFMTA's parking citation contest process that has a three-level framework—beginning with an administrative review, proceeding to an administrative hearing, and culminating in a appeal. The appeals process, as well as other operational details, will be finalized by the multi-department Large Vehicle Taskforce and published on the designated city webpage and shared with all Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Applicants.

Our commitment to due process is integral to our goal of creating a comprehensive approach that balances immediate action with compassionate care for people experiencing vehicular homelessness.

Thank you all for your ongoing support and collaboration on this critical issue impacting vulnerable San Franciscans.

Item 13

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Resolution of the Bicycle Advisory Committee
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:51:00 PM
Attachments:	Resolution to Connect Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park and Improve Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Along Route.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee, submitting a Resolution in Support of Connecting Golden Gate Slow Street to Golen Gate Park and Improving Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Along Route.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Brandon Powell <brandonpowell@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: Resolution of the Bicycle Advisory Committee

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

Victor,

My name is Brandon Powell, and as of the June 23 meeting of the Bicycle Advisory Committee, I am now its chairperson. Please find attached the committee's resolution regarding safety improvements to connect Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park for distribution to the Board of Supervisors.

Warm regards,
Brandon Powell
Chairperson, San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee
City Hall, Room 408
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Resolution in Support of Connecting Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park and Improving Bicyclist and Pedestrian Safety Along Route

June 23, 2025

WHEREAS, Golden Gate Ave. officially became part of the Slow Street network on December 6, 2022 to "improve safety and support active transportation on this corridor" and provide an important connection to "parks, schools, and the University of San Francisco," and,

WHEREAS, in September 2020, the Transportation Authority allocated funds to SFMTA to implement the designs and recommendations identified through Fulton Street Safety Project study to improve safety for people walking or biking across the 1.5 miles of Fulton Street between Stanyan and La Playa streets; and,

WHEREAS, the Fulton/Stanyan entrance to Golden Gate Park is listed on the San Francisco Bike Map and Walking Guide as a dedicated, off-street BikePath/Multi-use Trail, and,

WHEREAS, there is currently no bicycle infrastructure connecting Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park and the wayfinding signs at Golden Gate and Parker are incorrect and outdated, and,

WHEREAS, Fulton Street is crossed by thousands of people walking or biking to the park everyday and the Fulton/Stanyan entrance to Golden Gate Park is a popular entrance for people on foot and bicycle every day of the week; and,

WHEREAS, the intersection at Fulton and Stanyan has outdated, insufficient and dangerous pedestrian infrastructure; and,

WHEREAS, there is currently an total absence of any bicycle infrastructure and wayfinding signs at the intersection of Fulton and Stanyan (ie: bike lanes, bike boxes, green paint); and,

WHEREAS, people on bikes and scooters already use McAllister as a connection from Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park and Arguello Blvd.; and,

WHEREAS, the intersection of Stanyan and McAllister has outdated, insufficient pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and is very dangerous for people on foot, bicycle or scooter due to lack of daylighting and safety features; and,

WHEREAS, there are Bay Wheels stations at Parker and Golden Gate, Turk and Stanyan, Fell and Stanyan, and Pompei Circle and JFK, increasing the number of people using bicycles from Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park; and,

San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee
City Hall, Room 408
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

WHEREAS, the west side of Stanyan between Fulton and McAllister could be transformed into a two-way protected bike lane because there are no driveways or Muni lines; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee supports the following safety improvements to connect Golden Gate Slow Street to Golden Gate Park: 1) new wayfinding signs at Golden Gate and Parker and Parker and McAllister, 2) green sharrows on Parker from Golden Gate to McAllister and on McAllister between Parker and Arguello, 3) improved bicycle/pedestrian safety at the intersection of McAllister and Stanyan, including daylighting, wayfinding, additional crosswalk with rapid flashing beacons and "Yield to Pedestrians Within Crosswalk" signs, and 4) adding protected 2-way bike lane on Stanyan between Fulton and McAllister; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee also supports the following safety improvements at the intersection of Fulton and Stanyan: 1) protected "Dutch" intersection at Fulton and Stanyan, 2) leading pedestrian intervals on all crosswalks, and 3) wayfinding signs entering Golden Gate Park.

District 1: Kristin Tièche - YES
District 2: Whitney Ericson - ABSENT
District 3: Vanessa Day - ABSENT
District 4: Tim Marcus - ABSENT
District 5: Melyssa Mendoza - YES
District 6: Mary Kay Chin - YES
District 7: Bert Hill - YES
District 8: Diane Serafini - YES
District 9: Brandon Powell - YES
District 10: Paul Wells - YES
District 11: Jeffrey Taliaferro - ABSENT

Signed _____ Date: June 24, 2025
Brandon Powell, Chair

Item 14

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: HSH Memo - Family Shelter Length of Stay Policy
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:45:00 AM
Attachments:	Outlook-ixyaakaz.png 7.8.2025_Family Shelter Length of Stay BOS Memo_HSH.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, submitting a memo on Family Shelter Length of Stay Policy.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:29 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>
Subject: HSH Memo - Family Shelter Length of Stay Policy

Good afternoon,

Attached please find a memo from HSH on the Family Shelter Length of Stay Policy we respectfully request is distributed to the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (She/Hers)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
dylan.schneider@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: **Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

From: Shireen McSpadden, Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

CC: Kunal Modi, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie

Date: July 8, 2025

Subject: Family Shelter Length of Stay Policy

In response to listening sessions with families using the shelter system, analysis of shelter outcomes data, and input from our service providers, HSH is moving forward with making the following changes to the Family Shelter Length of Stay policy, **effective October 1, 2025.**

We will spend the next quarter working with the Mayor's Office of Innovation and people with lived experience to improve processes, including communications and training materials for providers and clients. We will spend the month of September hosting trainings with family shelter providers and distributing updated materials to providers, clients and other stakeholders to ensure a smooth implementation of the updated policy.

To ensure that we have time to implement this properly, we will work with providers to issue a **blanket 90-day extension to all families currently in shelter** this month that will carry us through the launch of this new policy. This one-time extension ensures that families currently in shelter will not be subject to the current length of stay limit until the updated policy is in place. Incoming families will continue to receive an initial 90-day stay.

We believe the reforms being enacted by HSH address the objectives of a proposed Board of Supervisors ordinance (File No. 250390), and therefore the ordinance can be withdrawn.

Policy Change:

- 90-day initial length of stay limit/goal.
- **Change** the first 30-day extension to a 90-day extension that can be authorized directly by the responsible service provider.
- After the first 90-day extension, family may continue to receive 90-day extensions **with** the authorization of HSH if they meet the shelter extension eligibility criteria (outlined below).
- **No limit on extensions** as long as the family continues to meet shelter extension eligibility requirements.

Shelter Extension Criteria:

- **NEW: Client must consistently engage** with their case manager and participate in the housing search; **AND**
- Have a **medical condition** that is being treated; **or**
- Have a **pending** shelter or transitional housing placement; **or**
- Have a pending permanent housing **placement** (rapid rehousing, PSH or self-resolution); **or**
- Have **housing barriers** outside of the client's direct and immediate control (i.e. immigration-related, criminal background-related barriers).

Process Improvement:
Beginning in July 2025, HSH will engage with the Mayor's Office of Innovation and people with lived experience to run a short (2 month) human-centered design process to recreate all client-facing communications and training materials related the family shelter length of stay policy. The outcome would be a new set of communications materials, letters, flyers, and trainings (in multiple languages) to help shelter guests and staff better understand the policy and their responsibilities in the process.

Reporting and Updates
HSH will provide updates to the Board of Supervisors every 6 months about the impact of the policy on families and the overall system of care.

Case Management
HSH, in partnership with the Tipping Point Community will be rolling out a case management training program to ensure better and more consistent case management across the shelter system.

Shelter Grievance Procedures
HSH is developing the grievance process for this policy within the existing shelter grievance procedure for any families who want to appeal the denial of a requested extensions by providers. This process will be finalized before the effective date of this policy and will be included in the provider trainings.

Thank you all for your ongoing support and collaboration on this critical issue impacting vulnerable San Franciscans.

Item 15

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on Gifts Received by Public Library FY 2024-25
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:51:00 AM
Attachments:	SFPL Gift List and Letter of FY 2024-25 to BOS.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Library, submitting an Annual Gift Report for FY 2024-2025, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Jiang, Feng Ling (LIB) <fengling.jiang@sfpl.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lindsley, Lovely (LIB) <lovely.lindsley@sfpl.org>; Fernandez, Mike (LIB) <mike.fernandez@sfpl.org>
Subject: Annual Report on Gifts Received by Public Library FY 2024-25

Hello,

Please find attached FY 2024-25 Annual Report on gifts received by the San Francisco Public Library.

Thank you,
Susan

Docusign Envelope ID: A5FA7C62-76E1-4446-84BE-37DE1B83BB33

San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street (Civic Center)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Date: July 09, 2025
To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: San Francisco Public Library-Finance Department
Subject: FY 2024-25 Annual Gift Report

MEMORANDUM

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.100-305, this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with a report on gifts received by the Department during FY 2024-2025.

Please find the attached report for your reference.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Mike Fernandez
FF01AD3ECD1D498...

Mike Fernandez
Chief Financial Officer

cc: File, SFPL-Finance Department

Docusign Envelope ID: A5FA7C62-76E1-4448-84BE-37DE1B83BB33

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
GIFT RECORD
FY2024-2025

Date Received by SFPL Foundation	Source	Value	Gift Description	Purpose
07/11/24	Ellen Smith	$ 250.00	Check	Gift/$62.50 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$62.50 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$125.00 for Library Services & Program Support
06/15/24	Charles Schwab Ronald J. Gilson and Nina Gilson	$ 1,000.00	Check	Gift/$250.00 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$250.00 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$500.00 for Library Services & Program Support
08/22/24	Richard Lerche	$ 100.00	Check	Gift/Library Services & Program Support
09/12/24	Marjory Hall	$ 100.00	Check	Book & Audiovisual Materials from Hormel Fund
11/14/24	Carolyn Cheung	$ 500.00	Check	Gift/$250 for Books and Materials-Adult & Gift/$250 for Books and Materials-Youth
11/14/24	Yumiko Westland	$ 150.00	Check	$150 for Library Services & Program Support
11/21/24	Fidelity Linda Chodos 2024 Donation	$ 100.00	Check	Gift/$25 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$25 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/50 for Library Services & Program Support
12/05/24	Patricia Ryland	$ 20.00	Check	Gift/Library Services & Program Support
12/05/24	Thelma Lai-Chang/Vernon W. Cheng	$ 100.00	Check	Gift/$25.00 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$25.00 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$50.00 for Library Services & Program Support
12/19/24	Mandy Mun Sum Woo	$ 100.00	Check	Gift/$25.00 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$25.00 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$50.00 for Library Services & Program Support
01/09/25	Joseph J. Borero	$ 500.00	Check	Gift/$125.00 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$125.00 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$250.00 for Library Services & Program Support
01/09/25	Rick L Wing	$ 500.00	Check	Gift/$125.00 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$125.00 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$250.00 for Library Services & Program Support
01/09/25	Henry & Denise Louie	$ 150.00	Check	Gift/$37.50 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$37.50 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$75.00 for Library Services & Program Support
01/16/25	Joyce & Robert Kurtz	$ 150.00	Check	Gift/$37.50 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$37.50 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$75.00 for Library Services & Program Support
01/16/25	E. Lopez	$ 25.00	Check	Gift/$6.25 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$6.25 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$12.5 for Library Services & Program Support
04/03/25	Ruth Xin-Yi Chew	$ 75.00	Check	Gift/$18.75 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$18.75 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$37.50 for Library Services & Program Support
04/16/25	American Management Association	$ 5,790.00	In-Kind Donation	Management Programs
04/17/25	Frances Quan	$ 300.00	Check	Gift for Library Services & Program Support
04/23/25	Sally Cowan	$ 100.00	Check	Gift for Library Services & Program Support
05/15/25	Ruth L. Moffatt	$ 50.00	Check	Gift/$25 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$25 for Books and Materials-Youth
06/05/25	Natalia Banderas	$ 25.00	Cash	Gift for Library Services & Program Support
06/09/25	Brenda Kay Moreno	$ 20.00	Credit Card	Gift/$5 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$5 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$10 for Library Services & Program Support
06/12/25	Marc Robbins	$ 15,000.00	Check	accepted per admin code 10.100-87 Library Grant Fund Gift/$3,750 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$3,750 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$7,500 for Library Services & Program Support
06/26/25	Katherine G. Onate	$ 200.00	Check	Gift/$50 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$50 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/$100 for Library Services & Program Support
06/26/25	Julie Anderson	$ 200.00	Check	Gift/$100 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/$100 for Books and Materials-Youth
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Andi Chen	$ 141.23	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Cecile Leung	$ 71.76	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Grace Wu	$ 73.83	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Jane Harrison	$ 17.37	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Luca Fox	$ 138.79	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: anonymous	$ 48.86	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
July 2024 - December 2024	American Online Giving Foundation: Tracey Katayama	$ 179.41	Check	Books and Materials for Adult & Youth, and Library Services & Program Support
		$ 26,176.25		

Item 16

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SFPUC Quarterly Green Infrastructure Grant Program Report - Q2 2025
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:36:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png GIGP BOS Update_Q22025.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, submitting the Quarterly Report to the Board of Supervisors (April – June 2025) on the Status of Green Infrastructure Grant Program, in accordance with Ordinance No. 207-24.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:04 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>; Halliday, Kylie (PUC) <KHalliday@sfwater.org>; Avery, Collin (PUC) <CAvery@sfwater.org>; Logsdon, Willis (PUC) <WLogsdon@sfwater.org>
Subject: SFPUC Quarterly Green Infrastructure Grant Program Report - Q2 2025

Hello BOS team,

Please find attached the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Quarterly Report to the Board of Supervisors (April – June 2025) on the Status of Green Infrastructure Grant Program. This

report is being submitted in accordance with Ordinance No. 101-20.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cellphone: 628-249-8600
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Green Infrastructure Grant Program:
Board of Supervisors Quarterly Update

April – June 2025

Program Summary

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Green Infrastructure Grant Program funds the design and construction of green stormwater infrastructure on large properties and in the public right-of-way, with the goal of reducing stormwater runoff while delivering public benefits that enhance the quality of life for all SFPUC rate payers. Project types can include permeable pavement, bioretention, rainwater harvesting, rain gardens, and vegetated roofs.

To receive funding under the Grant Program each project must:

1. Be located on a parcel and/or in public right-of-way that discharges to an SFPUC-owned and operated sewer system service area.
2. Manage stormwater runoff from a minimum impervious area of 0.5 acres.
3. Capture the 90th percentile storm (0.75-inch depth) with the proposed green infrastructure features.
4. Provide at least two (2) of the identified co-benefits from the program list, which can be found in the Grantee Guidebook.
5. Have a grant team that collectively demonstrates a history of successful project implementation and has previous experience designing, constructing, and/or maintaining green infrastructure, and be in good standing in all currently active Green Infrastructure Grant Program projects.

More information on the Grant Program can be found at http://www.sfpuc.gov/gigrants.

Quarterly Highlights

During the reporting period, SFPUC closed the Spring 2025 application cycle. Four applications were received during the Spring 2025 cycle: Jackson Playground, Bernal Heights Recreation Center, Louis Sutter Playground, and Innes Avenue Rebuild, totally just under $3.6M in total requested funding. The applications are currently being reviewed and evaluated by the SFPUC grant application reviewers.

During the reporting period, one project continued construction (Buchanan Street Mall), one project completed construction (Everett Middle School), six projects began construction (Project Artaud, Jefferson Elementary School, St Thomas More, Buena Vista Horace Mann K-8, Visitacion Valley Middle School, and Thurgood Marshall High School), and six projects (Mariners Village, Cornerstone Cambridge and Silver Campuses, Visitacion Valley Elementary School, El Dorado Elementary School, and Church of the Visitacion) continued design and community engagement. During the reporting period, the Grant team completed one new site visit and two new opportunities assessments for prospective applicants.

San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Program Statistics (February 2019 – June 2025)

Since the launch of the Green Infrastructure Grant Program in February 2019, the SFPUC has awarded grants to 26 projects with a total of approximately $26.5M in funding. The following program summary statistics are as of June 30, 2025:

- Applications Received: **26**
- Applications Awarded: **26**
- Active Projects: **15**
- Projects Completed: **9**
- Total Funding Awarded: **$26.5M**
- Potential Stormwater Captured by Awarded Projects: **16.3 million gallons per year**
- Property Site Visits Conducted by Technical Team: **68**
- Site Opportunities Assessments Completed: **38**

San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Green Infrastructure Grant Program Awarded Projects to Date

Project Name	Status	Watershed	Grant Amount	Impervious Area Managed (acres)	Estimated Stormwater Volume Managed (gal/yr)
Panorama Elementary School	Awarded Fall 2024	Islais Creek	$1,955,686	1.92	955,000
Project Artaud	Bid Selection	Channel	$684,409	0.79	377,000
Lafayette Elementary School	Complete	Sunset	$487,891	0.56	341,000
Bessie Carmichael Middle School	Complete	Channel	$521,427	0.61	233,000
Lycee Francais SF Ortega Campus	Complete	Sunset	$480,958	0.61	358,000
St. Anne of the Sunset Church & School	Complete	Sunset	$1,522,995	1.71	1,089,000
Leonard R. Flynn Elementary School	Construction	Islais Creek	$642,714	0.6	322,000
Buena Vista Horace Mann School	Construction	Channel	$629,423	0.7	318,000
Thurgood Marshall High School	Construction	Islais Creek	$1,999,465	2.20	1,166,000
Visitacion Valley Middle School	Construction	Sunnydale	$1,999,967	4.40	2,250,000
Jefferson Elementary School	Construction	Sunset	$796,670	0.86	462,000
Buchanan Street Mall	Construction	Channel	$750,475	0.82	365,000
St. Thomas More Church & School	Construction	Lake Merced	$1,118,958	1.50	782,000
Everett Middle School	Construction Complete	Channel	$1,874,496	2.03	1,060,000
Crocker Amazon Park	Construction Complete	Sunnydale	$850,812	1.1	593,000
St. Thomas the Apostle Church & School	Construction Complete	Sunset	$762,781	0.8	483,000
St. Monica Catholic Church & School	Construction Complete	Richmond	$773,728	0.83	394,000
St. Emydius Church & School	Construction Complete	Lake Merced	$873,136	0.9	445,000
Church of the Visitacion Church & School	Design Phase	Sunnydale	$1,727,103	1.86	925,000
El Dorado Elementary School	Design Phase	Sunnydale	$1,412,016	1.69	913,000
Visitacion Valley Elementary School	Design Phase	Sunnydale	$883,092	0.95	489,000
Mariners Village	Design Phase	Islais Creek	$1,154,174	1.24	672,000
Cornerstone Academy, Cambridge	Design Phase	Yosemite	$1,509,857	1.62	792,000
Cornerstone Academy, Silver	Design Phase	Islais Creek	$958,405	1.03	554,000
Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church	Withdrawn	Lake Merced	$127,041	-	-
Louis Sutter Playground	Withdrawn	Yosemite	$0	-	-
Total			**$26,497,679**	**31.3**	**16,338,000**

SFPUC Green Infrastructure Grant Program Projects to Date

0 0.5 1 2 Miles

- Awarded Projects
- Completed Projects
- Interested Properties and Site Visits
- Withdrawn Projects
- Supervisor Districts

Please visit the [program web map] for further details on each project.

Everett Middle School (construction complete)

Completed construction of new rain gardens and rainwater harvesting cistern

St Anne of the Sunset Church and School (project complete)

Completed construction of new rain gardens

St Monica Church and School (construction complete)

Completed construction of new rain gardens



St Thomas the Apostle Church and School (construction complete)

Completed construction of new rain gardens

Item 17

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SFPD Resolution 25-54, Approval to accept donation of Soft Interview Room, valued at $2,275.08.
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:47:00 PM
Attachments:	Res 25-54 Approval to accept donation of soft interview room, $2,275.08.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached from the Police Commission approval of **San Francisco Police Department Resolution No. 25-54:**

Approval to accept donation of soft interview room designed by non-profit organization, Project Beloved, for the San Francisco Police Department, Valued at $2,275.08.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Singh, Kristine (POL) <kristine.singh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:28 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Reynolds, Sondra (POL) <sondra.reynolds@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPD Resolution 25-54, Approval to accept donation of Soft Interview Room, valued at $2,275.08.

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

For informational purposes only, please see attached, SFPD Resolution No. 25-54, Commission approval to accept donation of Soft Interview Room, valued at $2,275.08.

Regards,

Kristine Singh
Exec. Asst.
For Sergeant Stacy Youngblood, Secretary to the Police Commission

Police Commission
SFPD Headquarters
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Desk: 415-837-7072

NOTICE: The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

C. DON CLAY
President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Vice President

CINDY ELIAS
Commissioner

LARRY YEE
Commissioner

W.S. WILSON LEUNG
Commissioner

MATTIE SCOTT
Commissioner

PRATIBHA TEKKEY
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary

July 10, 2025

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, July 9, 2025, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 25-54

APPROVAL TO ACCEPT DONATION OF SOFT INTERVIEW ROOM DESIGNED BY NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION, PROJECT BELOVED, FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT, VALUED AT $2,275.08;

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission approves acceptance of donation of Soft Interview room designed by non-profit organization, Project Beloved, for the San Francisco Police Department, valued at $2,275.08 *(A soft interview room is a thoughtfully designed space used primarily for interviewing vulnerable individuals-such as children, trauma survivors, or victims of abuse in a way that feels safe, calm, and non-threatening. These rooms are commonly found in child advocacy centers, police stations, social services, and mental health facilities.)*

AYES: Commissioners Yee, Scott, Elias, Leung, Tekkey, Vice President Benedicto and President Clay

Very truly yours,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary
THE POLICE COMMISSION

1211/ks

cc: Sergeant K. Lopez/SVU
A/Captain D. Silver/SVU
Chief Financial Officer K. Wu/Fiscal
Manager L. Wu/Fiscal

Memorandum

San Francisco Police Department

To: Acting Captain Daniel Silver
Commanding Officer
Special Victims Unit

From: Sergeant Kimberly Lopez #321
Special Victims Unit

Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025

Subject: Soft Interview Room

APPROVED YES NO
A/Lt. Flores #683 ☑ ☐
A/C DANIEL SILVER #4238 ☑ ☐
A/Capt. THOMAS MAGUIRE #1158 ☑ ☐
Cmdr. Mark Im #2096

I would like to request approval for Project Beloved, a non-profit organization to design and provide a soft interview room for the San Francisco Police Department.

A soft interview room is a thoughtfully designed space used primarily for interviewing vulnerable individuals—such as children, trauma survivors, or victims of abuse in a way that feels safe, calm, and non-threatening. These rooms are commonly found in child advocacy centers, police stations, social services, and mental health facilities.

Key Features of a Soft Interview Room:

1. Warm, Non-Clinical Atmosphere
   - Decorated more like a living room than an office or interrogation room.
   - Soft, neutral colors on the walls—pastels or earth tones—to promote calmness.
   - Warm, ambient lighting instead of bright fluorescents.
2. Comfortable Furnishings
   - Cozy chairs or sofas instead of hard, institutional seating.
   - Small tables for drawing or playing.
   - Sometimes it includes plush rugs, throw pillows, or soft toys (especially in child-focused settings).
3. Minimal Distractions
   - The room is intentionally uncluttered but welcoming.
   - Toys, books, or fidget items might be available to help reduce anxiety or give children something to hold.
4. Technology for Recording (Discreet)
   - Equipped with discreet audio and video recording equipment to document interviews for legal or therapeutic purposes.
   - Set up to avoid drawing attention or making the subject feel observed or judged.
5. Safety Considerations
   - Furniture and decor are chosen to be safe and non-threatening—no sharp corners or hard edges.

Purpose:
The goal of a soft interview room is to build trust and promote open communication. By making the space feel less institutional and more like a familiar home environment, it

helps put the interviewee at ease, which is especially important when dealing with traumatic or sensitive topics.

Having a dedicated, quiet, and comfortable space will help create a more relaxed environment, allowing both the investigators and victims to communicate more effectively.

What is Project Beloved?

Project Beloved is a Texas-based nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting survivors of sexual assault and advocating for systemic change in how such cases are handled. Founded by Tracy Matheson following the tragic death of her daughter, Molly Jane, in 2017, the organization aims to transform the experience of reporting sexual assault into one that is compassionate, and survivor centered.

Mission and Programs
Project Beloved focuses on three main areas:

1. Beloved Bundles: These are care packages provided to survivors after a forensic exam, containing clothing, hygiene products, and other essentials to ensure they leave the hospital with dignity.
2. Soft Interview Rooms: The organization partners with law enforcement agencies to redesign interview spaces, making them more comfortable and trauma informed. These rooms aim to help survivors feel safe and supported during interviews.
3. Molly Jane Matheson Memorial Scholarship: This scholarship provides financial assistance to students pursuing degrees in social work, continuing Molly Jane's legacy of advocacy and support for others.

Impact and Reach
Since its inception, Project Beloved has expanded its initiative across various states, collaborating with multiple law enforcement agencies to implement soft interview rooms. These efforts have been featured in several news outlets, highlighting the organization's growing influence in advocating for survivors.

Tracy Matheson from Project Beloved stated in her email to me, “As long as we know the Command Staff approves and supports the concept of a Soft Interview Room, and we know it will be used to assist the investigation of sexual assault cases, we say yes, and we add you to our waitlist. We are in full support of its use with the investigation of other crimes as well. We provide everything for the room, except for the paint. Our next open slot is April 2026.”

I am attaching a copy of the invoice with this memo, documenting the tentative cost for the room which is calculated to approximately: $2,275.08.

I emailed Sergeant Maureen Leonard with the Operations Bureau 10B/PLES department. Sergeant Maureen Leonard looked at the department’s current records and

at a 10B vendor list from 12/4/24-6/1/25 and confirmed that Project Beloved, Tracy Matheson have not received 10B services.

Deputy City Attorney Jen Huber responded via email and advised there were no legal issues with acceptance of this gift.

Kimmie Wu the Chief Financial Officer advised via email that the gift amount is under $10,000 and will not need approval from the Board of Supervisors.

I respectfully request this matter be placed on the Police Commission's agenda for the acceptance of this generous gift.

Outlook

Re: Soft interview room

From Shey Thompson <shey@projectbeloved.org>
Date Mon 6/2/2025 3:44 PM
To Lopez, Kimberly (POL) <kimberly.m.lopez@sfgov.org>

Hi Kimberly!

So excited to help in any way that we can for your Soft Interview Room. Here is a very basic break down of what goes into our rooms and a general idea of their cost. Please let me know if you need anything else!

Swivel Chairs (Qty: 3) - $1,034.97

Coffee Table - $139.99

Console Table - $134.99

Rug - $238.33

Floor lamp - $159.99

Table lamp - $81.99

Round mirror - $99.99

Weighted blanket - $56.99

Throw blanket - $32.99

Rolling side table - $147.89

Blanket basket - $49.99

Lavender Spray - $15.00

Decorative piece - $21.30

Decorative plant - $40.99

Kleenex - $3.69

Small basket - $15.99

Thank you,
Shey

Shey Viard
Administrative Assistant
Project Beloved
p: 817.307.1556
a: 1021 Foch Street
Fort Worth, TX 76107
w: projectbeloved.org e: shey@projectbeloved.org

From: Lopez, Kimberly (POL) <kimberly.m.lopez@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:27 PM
To: Tracy Matheson <tracy@projectbeloved.org>; Shey Thompson <shey@projectbeloved.org>
Subject: Re: Soft interview room

Yes, of course. Thank you!

Sgt. Kimberly Lopez #321
SVU-Human Trafficking
415-553-7902 Desk
415-696-0428 Work Cell

From: Tracy Matheson <tracy@projectbeloved.org>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 10:13 AM
To: Lopez, Kimberly (POL) <kimberly.m.lopez@sfgov.org>; Shey Thompson <shey@projectbeloved.org>
Subject: Re: Soft interview room

Kimberly
We have received this request from other agencies. No worries.

Is it OK that the list is a general list?
It would be similar to what we would include for your room. As we do not have a specific design yet... this would be simplest.

I have copied Shey on this email and she can easily provide you with that.

Please advise.

All the best

SFPD DONOR DISCLOSURE/GIFT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM

Thank you for your generous contribution to the San Francisco Police Department. **Donors must complete and provide this form to the SFPD prior or at time of donation delivery.** Forms should be returned to:

Mail: San Francisco Police Department
Attn: Fiscal
1245 Third Street. San Francisco, CA 94158

Fax: (415)575-6085
Please include cover page with: Attn: Donor Disclosure
Email: sfpdfiscal@sfgov.org

PLEASE NOTE: In compliance with the San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance*, IRS regulations and the City and County of San Francisco's donation policy the SFPD:

- DOES NOT ACCEPT ANONYMOUS DONATIONS. DONOR INFORMATION MUST BE PROVIDED IN THIS FORM
- THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED IN ITS ENTIRETY FOR DONATIONS TO BE ACCEPTED.
- THE OFFICIAL DONOR WILL BE ACKNOWLEDGED ON THE SFFD WEBSITE AND OTHER PUBLIC TAX AND FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS AS REQUIRED BY LAW

Donation Information: Please indicate if the donation/gift is: ☑ In-Kind Items ☐ Cash/Monetary

Official Donor : Project Beloved (Individual, Organization, Company) Date of Donation: 04/30/2026 (Month/Day/Year)

Gift/Donation Description: Donation of soft interview room Cash Value or Estimated Value of Items $ 2,275.08

Contact Information: Please indicate if the contact information is: ☑ Business/Corporate/Community Organization ☐ Residence/Individual

First and Last Name: Tracy Matheson Telephone: 817-789-2115 Email: tracy@projectbeloved.org

Mailing Address: 1021 Foch Street Fort Worth, TX 76107
(Street / Apt./Suite / City / State / Zip)

Financial Interest: The Sunshine Ordinance requires that a department receiving a gift of money, goods or services worth $100 or more report any financial interest the donor has involving the San Francisco City government. Please check the appropriate box or boxes that describe your financial interest(s) in the City.

☐ Contract with City ☐ Other Financial Interest
☐ Pending request for a City Contract, Grant, Permit or Other Entitlement for Use
DESCRIBE:

☑ No Financial Interest
☐ Grant from the City

☐ Lease of Space to or from the City
☐ City License, Permit or Entitlement for Use
DESCRIBE

*The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67) as approved by the San Francisco voters in 1999, provides that SEC. 67.29-.6 Sources of Outside Funding. No official or employee or agent of the city shall accept, allow to be collected, or direct or influence the spending of , any money, or any goods or services worth more than one hundred dollars in aggregate, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting any City function unless the amount and source of all such funds is disclosed as a public record and made available on the website for the department to which the funds are directed. When such funds are provided or managed by an entity, and not an individual, that entity must agree in writing to abide by this ordinance. The disclosure shall include the names of all individuals or organizations contributing such money and a statement as to any financial interest the contributor has involving the City.

Item 18

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	4 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:07:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for 4 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Requester: Alejandro Garcia
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000008506
Requested total cost: $150,000.00
Short Description: Cooper Surgical Inc is a primary provider of surgical and laparoscopic supplies and instruments for specialized needs of women's surgery and OB/Gyn treatment an

Requester: Vicky Griffith
Department: PUC
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000015616
Requested total cost: $19,500.00
Short Description: Local food purchases from local food retail store within 15 miles of Moccasin for emergency and facility tours

Requester: Wendy Chan
Department: POL
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000046161
Requested total cost: $5,000.00
Short Description: Specialized lidars certification to manufactory specificatiion

Requester: Sherri Li
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000009020
Requested total cost: $1,369.80
Short Description: Laser Labels Bulk Pack / COM

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-07-10 14:03:37 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004407	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Vicky Griffith	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Steve Ritchie	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-07-01 13:27:47	Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(209) 877-3299
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vicky Griffith
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Local food purchases from local food retail store within 15 miles of Moccasin for emergency and facility tours

Supplier ID:	0000015616	Requested Amount:	$19,500.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$19,500.00

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000941746
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-02
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	true
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	false
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

Mar-Val food store is the only local food retailer within a 15 mile radius to Moccasin. Food is required for emergencies such as floods and fires. HHW also host up-country tours for city and public tours of the facilities that are remote and have no food sources near requiring all food be purchased and delivered to the location.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Step by step instructions have been emailed to supplier tami.edwards@marvalfoodstores.com to work towards becoming a compliant supplier. Supplier not willing to make the effort of becoming a supplier.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Regina Chan
CMD Analyst Decision:	Rejected	Select the reason for this request:	
CMD Analyst Comments:	Mar-Val Food Store / Supplier ID 0000015616 is Equal Benefits compliant a waiver is not requried.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :
12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:
12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:
12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:
12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

Mar-Val food store is the only local food retailer within a 15 mile radius to Moccasin. Food is required for emergencies such as floods and fires. HHW also host up-country tours for city dignitaries and public tours of the facilities that are remote and do not have food sources near so all food must be purchased and delivered to the upcountry locations.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

Mar-Val food store is the only local food retailer within a 15 mile radius to Moccasin. Food is required for emergencies such as floods and fires. HHW also host up-country tours for city dignitaries and public tours of the facilities that are remote and do not have food sources near so all food must be purchased and delivered to the upcountry locations.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

This waiver request is for the only food supplier within the 15 mile radius of Moccasin. Requests for supplier to become complaint have been made each year with the instructions and the need for compliance emailed as of lately this fy to the corporate office in Lodi Ca. where they are currently in review. This can be a timely matter and the needs of such rations are needed to be in place as Tuolumne County not only in peak fire season, but several tours are already scheduled for the season. Each year the supplier has not been willing to move forward with becoming a compliant supplier. The file has been escalated to our finance department to attempt to assist supplier to becoming compliant.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

Because for the Moccasin/Groveland community there are very few options and Mar-Val is the closest in proximity to our up-country tours. Due to the remote locations, choices are limited for sources for such emergencies.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Not Applicable

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004407
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Steve Ritchie	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	2025-07-01 13:36:12		2025-07-08 14:39:46 - Steve Ritchie (Comments) reply from: SRitchie@sfwater.org Approved. Steven Ritchie. Ref:TIS5967635_S8aICpHTBjZUsi3XfKhT

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 1f3330ecebaa2e50302bf284dad0cdea
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-08 14:39:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-08 14:39:47	2025-07-08 14:48:56	9 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-01 13:27:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Draft	2025-07-01 13:27:47	2025-07-01 13:36:12	8 Minutes	true
2025-07-01 13:36:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-01 13:36:12	2025-07-08 14:39:47	7 Days 1 Hour 3 Minutes	true
2025-07-01 13:36:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Draft	2025-07-01 13:36:12	2025-07-01 13:36:12	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-08 14:49:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-07-08 14:48:56			false
2025-07-01 13:27:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Draft	2025-07-01 13:27:47	2025-07-01 13:36:12	8 Minutes	true
2025-07-08 14:49:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-07-08 14:48:56			false
2025-07-01 13:36:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Draft	2025-07-01 13:36:12	2025-07-01 13:36:12	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-08 14:39:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-08 14:39:47	2025-07-08 14:48:56	9 Minutes	true
2025-07-01 13:36:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004407	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-01 13:36:12	2025-07-08 14:39:47	7 Days 1 Hour 3 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-07-10 14:03:11 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004410	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Alejandro Garcia	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-07-03 14:32:10	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 206-7456
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Alejandro Garcia
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Cooper Surgical Inc is a primary provider of surgical and laparoscopic supplies and instruments for specialized needs of women's surgery and OB/Gyn treatment an

Supplier ID:	0000008506	Requested Amount:	$150,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$150,000.00
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000034320
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	true
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	false
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

Cooper Surgical Inc. (Cooper), vendor #000008506. Cooper is a primary provider of surgical and laparoscopic supplies and instruments for specialized needs of women's surgery and OB/Gyn treatment and care. Cooper products are used within the San Francisco Health Network which includes Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG), Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH), Primary Care Clinics (PCC) and Jail Health (JH).
Cooper products are used extensively in the Surgical/OR units as well as the outpatient Women's Health Clinics. Their products are preferred by the medical providers in the surgical units and clinics

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

We have also reached out to Cooper Surgical Inc by email letter requesting that they complete their 12B compliance.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Regina Chan
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Surgical and laparoscopic supplies and instruments for specialized needs of women's surgery and OB/Gyn treatment and care in the Surgical/OR units as well as the outpatient Women's Health Clinics within the San Francisco Health Network which includes Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG), Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH), Primary Care Clinics (PCC) and Jail Health (JH).		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(2) Bulk Purchasing

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:	

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI) Question1:	

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:	
12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:	
12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:	

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false
12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question2:	
12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:	

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:	

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:	
12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:	

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	
Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:	

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)
(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.
(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)
(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.
(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

To fulfill the Board's desire to obtain the cost savings from using a GPO, pursuant to Chapter 21A.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

We have also reached out to Cooper Surgical Inc by email letter requesting that they complete their 12B compliance.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

The purpose of Chapter 12B is to ensure equal access to benefits, including health benefits, regardless of one's protected category. The use of a GPO ensures DPH can access the goods and services it needs to provide healthcare to SF residents in a cost-effective and reliable manner, thereby increasing their access to healthcare regardless of their status. In this regard, the use of this Vizient contractor is aligned with the intent of Chapter 12B.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004410
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	2025-07-03 14:44:49		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = ca2557c5ebaae290302bf284dad0cdb3

Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-08 22:00:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Completed	2025-07-08 22:00:38			false
2025-07-03 15:20:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-03 15:19:58	2025-07-07 10:21:10	3 Days 19 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-07-03 14:32:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Draft	2025-07-03 14:32:11	2025-07-03 14:44:49	12 Minutes	true
2025-07-07 10:21:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-07 10:21:10	2025-07-08 22:00:38	1 Day 11 Hours 39 Minutes	true
2025-07-03 14:44:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Draft	2025-07-03 14:44:49	2025-07-03 15:19:58	35 Minutes	true
2025-07-03 14:44:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-03 14:44:49	2025-07-03 14:44:49	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-03 14:32:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Draft	2025-07-03 14:32:11	2025-07-03 14:44:49	12 Minutes	true
2025-07-03 15:20:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-03 15:19:58	2025-07-07 10:21:10	3 Days 19 Hours 1 Minute	true
2025-07-07 10:21:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-07-07 10:21:10	2025-07-08 22:00:38	1 Day 11 Hours 39 Minutes	true
2025-07-08 22:00:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Completed	2025-07-08 22:00:38			false
2025-07-03 14:44:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-03 14:44:49	2025-07-03 14:44:49	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-03 14:44:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004410	Draft	2025-07-03 14:44:49	2025-07-03 15:19:58	35 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-07-10 14:04:00 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004415	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval
Requested for:	Wendy Chan	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Kimmie Wu	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-07-09 10:50:51	Requesting Department:	
		Requester Phone:	(415) 837-7203
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Wendy Chan
		Watch list:	Wendy Chan, Wayne Lok

Short Description:

Specialized lidars certification to manufactory specificatiion

Supplier ID:	0000046161	Requested Amount:	$5,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$5,000.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000946085
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-09
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	true
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

(a) PB ELECTRONICS; (b) Calibrattes and repairs the radar/Lidar Unit to use in obtain speed vehicles. The Radar/Lidar need to use t in utilized the enforcement of speed citations. DOJ requires certify Laser/Lidar annually for accuratecy measuring; (c) PB ELECTRONICS specialized lidar certification to manufactory specification.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

We tried numerous times to have supplier to comply without any responds.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	CMD Director:
CMD Analyst Decision:	Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director

CMD Director:	CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI) Question1:	

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false
12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question2:	

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

It is essential because we want to enforce the speeding law.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

The need to have RADAR/LIDAR calibrtate annual according to DOJ requirement.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

We contact the supplier nemerous times to become a compiiance vendor but did not get any responds

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

No Compliance Supplier for this type of services.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Not Applicable

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004415
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Kimmie Wu	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	2025-07-09 10:54:26		2025-07-09 11:50:51 - Kimmie Wu (Comments) reply from: Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org Ref:TIS5983526_WnV0fQqO4bNq0UQkKzd6 Kimmie Wu Chief Financial Officer San Francisco Police Department Desk: 415-837-7213 Cell: 415-640-7757 CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 120c91033b6e6250cf49eef764e45a0c

Sort Order: None

8 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-09 10:54:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-09 10:54:26	2025-07-09 11:50:52	56 Minutes	true
2025-07-09 10:50:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Draft	2025-07-09 10:50:51	2025-07-09 10:54:26	3 Minutes	true
2025-07-09 10:54:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Draft	2025-07-09 10:54:26	2025-07-09 10:54:26	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-09 11:50:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-09 11:50:52			false
2025-07-09 10:54:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Draft	2025-07-09 10:54:26	2025-07-09 10:54:26	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-09 11:50:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-09 11:50:52			false
2025-07-09 10:54:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-09 10:54:26	2025-07-09 11:50:52	56 Minutes	true
2025-07-09 10:50:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004415	Draft	2025-07-09 10:50:51	2025-07-09 10:54:26	3 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-07-10 14:04:26 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004416	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval
Requested for:	Sherri Li	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-07-09 16:41:41	Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	+14155574250
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Sherri Li
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Laser Labels Bulk Pack / COM

Supplier ID:	0000009020	Requested Amount:	$1,369.80
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$1,369.80
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000946480
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-07-09
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	true
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	false
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

The supplier ULINE. We are requesting a waiver to purchase labels to use for our ILL/LINK+ system. Our system experiences a lot of preventable damage caused by the current labels which are too sticky. As a result, this also affects staff work time as they spend additional time peeling them off and removing residue.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

The supplier was emailed in the previous fiscal year and was unresponsive.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	CMD Director:
CMD Analyst Decision:	Select the reason for this request:
CMD Analyst Comments:	

CMD Director

CMD Director:	CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI) Question1:	

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false
12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question2:	

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

Not entering into this contract will result in the City, specifically the Library, having to continue using labels that are causing preventable damage to our collections.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

The staff member who requested these labels did their research looking at different vendors. The administrative analyst verified which vendors were city-approved.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

This waiver does not defeat the intent of this chapter because it contributes to the overall service of the library, specifically with our ILL/Link+ system.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List

Table name: sysapproval_approver

Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004416

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	2025-07-09 16:45:24		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = a95c2e4febeaa6d0302bf284dad0cd1f

Sort Order: None

8 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-07-09 16:45:15	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Draft	2025-07-09 16:45:11	2025-07-09 16:45:24	13 Seconds	true
2025-07-09 16:45:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Draft	2025-07-09 16:45:24	2025-07-10 09:15:24	16 Hours 30 Minutes	true
2025-07-10 09:15:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-10 09:15:24			false
2025-07-09 16:45:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-09 16:45:24	2025-07-09 16:45:24	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-10 09:15:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-07-10 09:15:24			false
2025-07-09 16:45:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Dept. Head approval	2025-07-09 16:45:24	2025-07-09 16:45:24	0 Seconds	true
2025-07-09 16:45:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Draft	2025-07-09 16:45:24	2025-07-10 09:15:24	16 Hours 30 Minutes	true
2025-07-09 16:45:15	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004416	Draft	2025-07-09 16:45:11	2025-07-09 16:45:24	13 Seconds	true

Item 19

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 JUL 07 PM04:57
BOS-11

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors – About Proposed Renew and Expand of Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District (CBD)

My name is Ben Chi Wan Pun and I serve as the trustee for the Pun Family Trust, which owns the property located at [112 Geneva Ave, San Francisco, Parcel #6975 - 024A]. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the forced inclusion of our residential property into the proposed renew and expand of the Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District (CBD).

Our property is located at Geneva Avenue, east of Frida Kahlo Way, and is geographically and characteristically separate from the Ocean Commercial District. Unlike Ocean Avenue, our neighborhood consists almost entirely of two-story residential homes, with no commercial activity—aside from two schools and a single apartment building. There is no commercial presence in our area to justify inclusion in a Business District.

I have several serious concerns regarding this proposal:

1. Unjustified Financial Burden:
   The proposed annual assessment for fiscal Year 2025-2026 for our property would be $544.92 or $479,581 for all Parcels. No clear justification or breakdown has been provided for this drastic tax hike. This raises concerns of mismanagement or potential misuse of funds, which merits an independent financial review.
2. Redundancy of Services:
   Many of the services promised by the CBD—such as street cleaning and graffiti removal—are already the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. Forcing homeowners to pay for duplicate services is inefficient and unjustified.
3. Lack of Accountability and Efficiency:
   The existing CBD services are often inefficient. It is not uncommon to see two or three workers focused on cleaning a small area while ignoring broader issues such as homelessness obstructions on sidewalk in front of business units within CBD.
4. Vague and Unsubstantiated Benefits:
   The proposal lists benefits that are largely speculative and not backed by specific plans or commitments. There is no clear explanation of how residential properties like ours would benefit.
5. Taxation Without Representation:
   The proposed assessment would be added to our property tax bill, functioning as a de facto tax increase. As such, this proposal should require approval by two-thirds of affected property owners, in accordance with Proposition 218.

In conclusion, this forced inclusion is not only inappropriate given our neighborhood's residential nature, but also imposes an undue financial burden without delivering clear or necessary benefits.

I respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to exclude residential properties located at Geneva Avenue east of Frida Kahlo Way from the proposed Ocean Avenue CBD renew and expansion.

Sincerely,
Ben Chi Wan Pun
Ben Chi Wan Pun 7/7/25
Trustee, The Pun Family Trust
[Property Address: 112 Geneva Ave, San Francisco, Ca 94112; Parcel # 6975-024A)

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Challenge of Renewal to Ocean Avenue Association renewal to include residential properties
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:49:42 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding community benefit districts.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *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 provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: wy Y <dragonflysfo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:30 PM
To: jacquline.hazelwood@sfgov.org; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Challenge of Renewal to Ocean Avenue Association renewal to include residential properties

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

City Of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor Ms. Chen District 11
Supervisor Ms. Melgar District 7

The Previous Emails Notation

THIS IS THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM...with AFFORDABLE HOUSING....and CITY BUREAUCRACIES !!!

WHEN TAXPAYERS ARE "DOUBLE TAX WITH so called CBD ASSOCIATION ASSESSMENTS!....WHAT A SCAM!!

THINKING "CBDs" will help increase Businesses is a FARCE!....IT ACTUALLY IS THE ROOT OF LOSING BUSINESSES...from HIGH LEASE / Property tax increase from so called CBDs!!

To NOT HAVE ANY EXEMPTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES, ZONED RESIDENTIAL is WRONG AND UNFAIR!

THIS IS A HARDSHIP FOR SENIOR CITIZENS LONG TERM RESIDENTS that can PUSH THEM OUT of SAN FRANCISCO because o
this "HOA TYPE ASSOCIATIONS" that UNFAIRLY INCREASE THEIR COST OF LIVING in their NEIGHBORHOOD and CITY!!!

STOP ANYMORE ARBITRUARY ENCROACHMENT OF OCEAN AVE ASSOCIATION CBD and other CBDs from "OVERREACHING ITS BOUNDARIES"!!

Chris Wong

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **wy Y** <dragonflysfo@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 2, 2025 at 1:53 PM
Subject: Challenge of Renewal to Ocean Avenue Association renewal to include residential properties
To: <chenstaff@sfgov.org>, <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>, <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>, <jacquelin.hazelwood@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors, (BOS)

<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

To: City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor of District 11, Ms. Chen
Supervisor of District 7 , Ms. Melgar

We the "Residential Properties from 2 Geneva to 248 Harold Ave, Protest and Vote Strongly against our Residential Properties to Ocean Ave Association CBD Renewal adding Property Tax Assessment and Increase in Property Taxes to affected Residential Zoned Properties!
This is UNFAIR and WRONG to include residential properties that DO NOT BENEFIT from OAA supplemental services for the Businesses along Ocean Ave!
We have and continue to take care of our own properties just like majority of Residential Properties of the City and County Of San Francisco!
To incur even Additional Property Taxes on TOP OF ALREADY HIGH PROPERTY TAXES for City and County Services Already Provided!
This is DOUBLE TAXATION without Representation and Voting of the Whole Districts 7 and 11 that border Ocean Ave CBD!...If that was done, be assured this Assessment and Voting would BE VOTED DOWN >>>FULL STOP!!
Ocean Ave Association CBD Benefits Everyone that shop and Live nearby, so should we have a "Usage Tax" added to their purchases from OAA CBD Commercial Stores and Services???.....NO WAY that would FLY!!!
This measure is an "Overreach and money grab by OAA like an HOA fees/taxation"!
Especially this Residential Block of Ocean Ave is a "Side Street from the Main Ocean Ave" ...and we cant even get "Street Sweeping or Parking Restrictions" on this parallel side street that many cars both of residents and nonresidents take advantage of this "No Restrictions" on Parking....We have City College, Muni Transit Terminal, and Balboa Park Bart Station that vehicles figure out to "Park for Free and No Street Sweeping, No Residential Restrictions" so they park for weeks and months, till we constantly have to report to 311 and Parking Enforcement to Cite vehicles parking over 72 hrs!...".We do that Reporting and Cleaning of this parallel side street of Ocean Ave" ....and there is a "Storm Drain" in corner of this side street that gets clogged up with "Trash" and do you think the City or OAA cleans up this area from clogging?...NO, WE DO THAT on our own VOLUNTEER Basis, because the CIty has refused to schedule Street Sweeping even with repeated reporting ,they just give some BS EXCUSES that the Street Sweeping Truck cannot fit in that AREA!.....REALLY???....No Problem for Recology Trucks etc. to come in Weekly!
Again we refute and challenge OAA to IMPOSE PROPERTY INCREASE TAXES for SERVICES we

do not or will not benefit and we are not COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES on ZONED RESIDENTIAL PARCELS!!

Especially my property at 248 Harold Ave, is not ADDRESSED TO OCEAN AVE!!
My Front Facing Home is on Harold Ave...only my fenced off backyard with retaining walls faces Ocean Ave!
Shall we also include any Residential Parcels that faces Ocean Ave or uses Ocean Ave to transit and shop there?....like mention before are we "Creating an HOA Type management within the City/County of San Francisco???....This is CRAZY, I bought this Single Family House and Residential Zoned Property before OAA was Formed, and now they want to include my residential property that is not even addressed to Ocean Ave or is a Business be added to its 15 Year Renewal of OAA CBD???
No..NO NO....I will and my residential neighbors that have been added to this UNFAIR ASSESMENT ASSOCIATION will Take All Legal Means to Litigate and REMOVE our Residential Parcels from this Scam OAA CBD Proposal!
If not RECTIFIED ASAP, OAA and the CITY will have to ANSWER to the COURTS!

Did you know the Executive Director,Christian Martin is not only the Director of Ocean Ave Association but of Soma West Community Benefit District (CBD) earning salary of over $200K + compensation, OAA salary not disclosed (interesting)??
This shows "Conflict of Interests" in managing and deploying CBDs in San Francisco and his resume shows previous CBD Executive positions in Trenton,New Jersey (TDA)...
This needs to be INVESTIGATED and CITY should Limit multiple CBD Executive Positions as CONFLICT OF INTERESTS and Possible SCAM of TAX PAYERS $$$$

Ingleside Neighbors, District 11
Chris Wong
248 Harold Ave
415-568-8298
dragonflysfo@gmail.com

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	15 Letters regarding File No. 250371
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:00:00 AM
Attachments:	15 Letters regarding File No. 250371.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 15 letters regarding File No. 250371, which is Item No. 39 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250371:** Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on July 8, 2025, at 3:00 p.m., to consider renewal and expansion of a property-based business improvement district, known as the Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District, pursuant to the California Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994 (Streets and Highways Code, Sections 36600 et seq.), and City and County of San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, Article 15; scheduled pursuant to the Resolution No. 208-25 contained in File No. 250368; adopted on May 6, 2025.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Linda - Little Oceanauts
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Rosendo Betancourt; info@oaacbd.org; Sabine Taliaferro; Gabriel Cory; Brit Bostic; Christian Martin; Oceanauts Info Little; Tina; Sandy
Subject: Support for Ocean Avenue Association Community Benefit District"s Renewal
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:54:30 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the renewal of the Ocean Avenue Association Community Benefit District (OAACBD). As a business owner on Ocean Avenue, I have witnessed firsthand the invaluable contributions OABA has made to our community over the past several years.

The OAACBD has been an indispensable resource for everyone along the Ocean Avenue and Ingleside corridor. From addressing pressing issues like **break-ins, garbage, and graffiti** to proactively informing small businesses about **beneficial programs** that enhance our operations, OAA has consistently demonstrated its commitment to our collective well-being.

Beyond their crucial support in day-to-day challenges, OAA has been a driving force behind **events that energize our local economy and foster community spirit**. Their **Boba Festival**, for instance, is a testament to their creativity in attracting visitors and showcasing local businesses. While my business wasn't a direct participant, we were honored to **collaborate with OAA on successful Halloween and Easter events** held at my establishment. These events brought hundreds of neighbors to Ocean Avenue, introducing them to the vibrant array of businesses and fostering a stronger sense of community.

Furthermore, OAACBD's dedication extends to initiatives that benefit everyone, including **weekly clean-ups, engaging wine walks, and essential mental health classes like relaxation and yoga**. These efforts not only improve the aesthetic and well-being of our area but also **consistently draw new people to Ocean Avenue**, encouraging them to discover the unique offerings of our local businesses.

In short, the Ocean Avenue Benefit Association is **critical to the vitality and continued success of businesses on Ocean Avenue**. Their consistent support, proactive initiatives, and successful events directly translate into a more vibrant, secure, and prosperous environment for us all. Renewing their bid is not just a decision; it's an investment in the future of our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Linda Won

Little Oceanauts Owner

1917 Ocean Avenue,

San Francisco, CA 94127

From: Lisa Napoli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In support of Ocean Avenue Assn
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 6:43:28 PM

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing as a co-founder of the Friends of Lakeside Village, a neighborhood non-profit established to improve the vitality of our local business corridor.

We'd like to express strong support for the Ocean Avenue Association expanding to include Lakeside Village. It's vital that we find a long term solution to keeping the business corridor tidy, and the OAA is the solution! The early morning sidewalk cleaning has made an important difference to our merchants and neighbors in making the area inviting for shopping and congregating.

Friends of Lakeside Village has been central to coordinating monthly volunteer clean ups too in partnership with Refuse Refuse. We value and respect the time our neighbors have put into picking up, but we also need regular service for the consistent level of tidiness we require to keep Lakeside Village vibrant.

Thank you for your help in keeping the corridor attractive as we work to draw in new businesses and families! We really appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

Lisa and Gregg Napoli

110 Junipero Serra Blvd.
San Francisco CA 94127

From:	Ingleside San Francisco
To:	ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Administrator, City (ADM); winsonma415@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: Reject Ocean Ave Association CBD Renewal
Date:	Sunday, July 6, 2025 2:02:08 PM

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

Supervisor Chen
Mayor Daniel Lurie

Ocean Ave Associaion Renewal and Extension of Added Residential Properties NOT On Ocean Ave or Benefits its SERVICES
is a VIOLATION of :

- Proposition 218
- Proposition 26
-Proposition 19

Please Take NOTICE that these will be used in APPEALS and LITIGATIONS against Ocean Ave Association, and Responsible City Officials and Departments

Chris Wong
& Neighbors of Ingleside District 11

On Sun, Jul 6, 2025 at 12:40 PM Ingleside San Francisco <inglesideneighbor@gmail.com> wrote:

> Chyanne Chen
> District 11
> Mayor Daniel Lurie
> Board of Supervisors
> Ms. Melgar
> District 7
>
> July 8, 2025
> Ocean Ave Renewal CBD
>
> We STRONGLY REJECT and VOTED "NO" on the Ballot to
> Extend and Renew Ocean Ave Association CBD
>
> -This is a UNDUE HARDSHIP to RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES that was ADDED to OAA CBD Assessments to INCREASE UNFAIR HIGH PROPERTY TAXES to RESIDENTIAL PARCELS!!
>
> - This Side street of Ocean Ave is NOT EVEN ON THE MAIN OCEAN AVE STREET! (it is not a through way conventional STREET) and only cars of nearby residents!
>
> -UNDUE HARDSHIP for SENIOR CITIZENS to STAY in their homes after over 15years

of residentship and was not a part of OAA initial zoning which is UNFAIR to NOW extend RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES that they deemed is NOW INCLUDED...this is ABSURD...WHY NOT INCLUDE THE WHOLE DISTRICTS of RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES that Ocean Ave is their MAIN Street of the Community?

-My Property Frontage is NOT on Ocean Ave but on Harold Ave...only my Fenced Backyard Lot faces this Side Street of Ocean Ave, and there is NO COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES on this side street of Ocean Ave that would benefit from OAA so called "Supplemental Services that Targets Businesses "!

-CONFLICT OF INTERESTS of Executive Director, Christian Martin of OAA and ALSO of West SOMA CBD in San Fransico RAISES QUESTIONS of CORRUPTION and DEPLOYING the SYSTEM to his BENEFIT....HE EARNS OVER $200K per Association for WHAT?...with RESUME of DEPLOYING his positions in mutiple CBDs here in San Francisco and previous in Trenton,New Jersey!...TO GET
HIGH PAYING SALARY OFF THE TAXPAYERS PROPERTY TAX FUNDS!!!
This is OUTRAGEOUS and CORRUPTION at the ROOT LEVEL of the CITY!

- Every Property owner in the City is Responsible to take care of their Parcels and Voluntarily Cleanup the Public Spaces Bordering their Private Property!

- We DONT NEED Another ADDED PROPERTY TAX INCREASE to FUND a so called NONPROFIT ASSOCIATION that only benefits the HIGHLY PAID EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR for litttle to NO BENEFITS TO THE BUSINESSES of OCEAN AVE....LOOK AT OUR MAIN STREET...LOSS OF TARGET,WALGREEN and CHASE BANK and other BUSINESSES on WEST END OF OCEAN AVE with VACANT "EL REY THEATRE" is CLEARLY SIGNS OF DECLINE!
(Because of HIGH LEASE $$ due to HIGH PROPERTY TAXES on TOP OF OAA ASSESSMENT PROPERTY TAXES is DOING THE OPPOSITE EFFECT of BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT...!!!

-Hanging decorative lighting and flower baskets and once in "BLUE MOON SIDEWALK CLEANUP" DOES NOT WARRANT ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAXES BY OAA FUNDING (VOLUNTEER and FUND RAISING) is the venue not RAISING UNFAIR ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAXES to PAY SOMEONE's HIGH SALARY FOR LITTLE TO NOTHING!!

Please REJECT and VOTE NO on Ocean Ave Association Renewal of 15 YEARS to INCREASE OUR PROPERTY TAXES without EXEMPTIONS for RESIDENTIAL and Especially to SENIOR CITIZENS Trying to keep AFFORDABLE HOUSING and staying in San Francisco!!

DONT BE PART OF THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM but the ROOT OF SOLUTIONS to a Beautiful and PROSPEROUS CITY!

WE DONT NEED A TYPE OF "HOA" TO our NEIGHBORHOODs and CITY to MAKE IT LESS AFFORDABLE!

THIS IS AN OVERREACH of OAA to INCREASE FUNDING to Include MORE PROPERTY PARCELS even if its RESIDENTIAL.....UNFAIR,if the WHOLE DISTRICT

11 and 7 Had to VOTE ON THIS ISSUE, IT WOULD SURELY NOT PASS!!

PLEASE HEAR OUR ANXIETY AND VOICES and DO THE RIGHT ACTIONS!!!

Chris Wong
& Neighbors of District 11
248 Harold Ave
San Francisco, Ca. 94112
415-568-8298

From: kelly@luchos.net
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support to expand OAA to Lakeside Village
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 8:25:21 AM

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

Hello -

I own Lucho's on Ocean ave in the Lakeside Village. I am writing to express my support the Ocean Avenue Association. To encourage visitors to support visit Lakeside Village we need help to keep our sidewalks and doorways clean and safe. When we do keep the streets safe and clean, customers feel safe and want to visit and support our small businesses.

Before our businesses even opened in the morning, Roland and his team gently moved along unhoused people and cleaned up after them. There's simply too much litter, grime, and worse problems for business owners and volunteers to keep up. We personally do not have the staff to clean up after the unhoused and pick up litter along the street in the morning.

The OAA will help us to keep the sidewalk lights on - these lights brighten up our restaurant parklet at Lucho's, which is also a safety measure for cars driving by.

I hope that you will vote YES to expand the OAA to Lakeside Village. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for consideration,

Kelly Barbieri
Lucho's

From: Robyn Bittle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support of the Ocean Avenue Association
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 5:36:53 PM

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

Hello to the Board of Supervisors,

Since we are unable to attend the meeting on Tuesday, July 8, we are writing to you instead as tenants of 2550 Ocean Avenue in Lakeside Village. We urge you to support the renewal and expansion of the Ocean Avenue Association.

Our building was previously a Walgreens that shut down during the pandemic. After years of vacancy, we invested heavily to renovate and revitalize the space to serve as our Ministry Center. We opened on September 29, 2024, and have been able to serve the local neighborhood and surrounding community through recovery, youth programs, outreach and more.

The OAA provided important services to us as tenants in Lakeside Village. Early in the morning, Roland and the OAA cleaning team were proactive about gently moving unhoused individuals living in our doorway and cleaning up after them. The OAA picked up litter and power-washed sidewalks. They even weeded sidewalk gardens, including the ones outside our property. The OAA's work increased the safety of families and volunteers utilizing our Ministry Center.

As you are well aware, following the financial ruin of Parks Alliance, OAA services were paused in early May. This has made operating on Ocean Avenue more difficult for us and our team.

Thank you in advance for supporting the expansion of the OAA. We hope that their work will soon restart in Lakeside Village.

Sincerely,

Pastors Robyn and Tim Bittle
The Father's House San Francisco

From: Ravi Lau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In Support of Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 3:58:22 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the continued funding of the Ocean Avenue Association Community Benefit District (OAA CBD).

The OAA has brought significant improvements to our neighborhood, including enhanced cleaning and maintenance, increased public safety, and vibrant community events that have benefited both local businesses and residents. These efforts have truly revitalized Ocean Avenue, making it a more attractive, welcoming, and prosperous place for all.

Our students at Lick-Wilmerding High School have also had the privilege of directly participating in these positive changes. Some have volunteered to help clean trash and set up holiday event decorations, and student vocalists and jazz instrumentalists have performed at OAA community events, sharing their talents and enriching the cultural life of our neighborhood. These experiences have provided our students with valuable opportunities for community engagement, leadership, and artistic expression.

As an OAA board member, I've had the privilege to collaborate with this dedicated team of neighbors and local community leaders who care deeply for this neighborhood, who are efficient with resources, and who are committed to transparency with all decisions.

For these reasons, I urge you to support the continued funding of the Ocean Avenue Association CBD, so that these vital public programs and community benefits can continue to grow.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Ravi Lau
Director of Public Purpose (Lick-Wilmerding H.S.)
Board Member (Ocean Avenue Association)
--
--
Ravi Lau (he/him)
Director of Public Purpose Programs
Center for Civic Engagement
Lick-Wilmerding High School
T: 415-333-4021 x334
The Center Blog

From: Kimberly Ramos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Ocean Avenue Association Renewal Merchant Testimonial
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 3:45:02 PM

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

Merchant Testimonial

Before opening my café, I lived in the neighborhood—but I wasn't really connected to it. I also grew up on this south west side of the city and it's always felt neglected compared to more densely populated neighborhoods in the city. I rarely heard about community events or new local spots outside of school or work events. That changed when the Ocean Avenue Association (OAA) started actively promoting neighborhood happenings and highlighting small businesses like mine. I believe neighborhood associations are vital for these neighborhoods that don't get as much traffic from tourists and visitors but do have a decent amount of people working, going to school and living here.

Since becoming a part of the OAA, I've seen firsthand how much they do to support both merchants and the broader community. They create visibility, bring people together, and make it easier for neighbors to discover and support local businesses.

Their efforts have helped my café grow and thrive, and they've built a real sense of connection in the neighborhood—something that benefits all of us.

— Kim, Charm Coffee San Francisco

1939 Ocean Avenue San Francisco CA 94127

From: Tracy Zhou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Rosendo Betancourt; Gabriel Cory; Sabine Taliaferro
Subject: Testimonial in Support of Ocean Avenue Association Renewal
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 3:42:58 PM

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

To the Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing this testimonial in strong support of the Ocean Avenue Association's renewal. As a small business owner on Ocean Avenue, I have personally witnessed and greatly benefited from the invaluable contributions this association makes to our community.

The Ocean Avenue Association plays a critical role in maintaining the vitality and appeal of our commercial corridor. Their consistent efforts in keeping Ocean Avenue clean from trash and graffiti significantly enhance the aesthetic and safety of the area, creating a more welcoming environment for both businesses and customers. This dedication to cleanliness directly impacts the positive perception of our Ingleside neighborhood.

Furthermore, the association's commitment to organizing and promoting events has been instrumental in driving increased foot traffic and exposure to small businesses like mine. These initiatives are vital for our economic well-being, providing much-needed opportunities for local enterprises to thrive and connect with a wider audience.

The Ocean Avenue Association is an indispensable partner to the small business community, and their work directly contributes to the economic health and vibrancy of Ocean Avenue. I urge you to consider their profound positive impact and approve their renewal for continued service.

Although I am unable to attend the in-person hearing on July 8th, please know that my written testimonial is sincere and reflects my genuine support.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Tracy Zhou

Purtea 1422 Ocean Ave SF, CA 94112

photo

Tracy Z.
President, Purtea

707-327-0123 | www.instagram.com/purtea.sf/
tracysinc8@gmail.com | 1422 Ocean Ave SF, CA 94112

Create your own email signature

From: David DiLullo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: July 8 Board of Supervisors Meeting for Ocean Ave Association
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:27:08 PM

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

Hello,

As the Senior Minister for the **Unity Spiritual Center of San Francisco at 2690 Ocean Avenue**, I am writing to support the expansion of the Ocean Avenue Association to Lakeside Village.

I am also representing our organization's nonprofit Board as the Property Owner.

We are in a fragile growth phase, and we simply do not have enough volunteers to be able to do this kind of work ourselves. (and our population is elderly)

OAA provides important services to help us clean up litter, grime (and worse) in our doorways and on sidewalks. We need OAA's help to maintain and weed the sidewalk gardens and replace plants when necessary — such as on the corner of Ocean and 19th next to our property where a sidewalk tree has died. We appreciate the marketing and promotion that they offer through newsletters, social media, events, and other activities.

We want to be part of the OAA because this will benefit our church and our entire community.

Please don't hesitate to reach me if you have any questions or if I can support this effort in any other way.

Rev. David DiLullo
Senior Minister
Unity Spiritual Center of San Francisco
https://sfunity.org
408-892-9019

From: Johnny Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Ray Leung; Kath Tsakalakis
Subject: July 8 Board of Supervisor meeting for OAA
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 9:08:27 AM

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

I am unable to attend your meeting, but as the Property Owner for 2501-1519 Ocean Avenue, I am writing to support the expansion of the Ocean Avenue Association to Lakeside Village. OAA provides important services to help us clean up graffiti, litter (and worse) in our doorways and on sidewalks, and regular power washing to remove grime. We need OAA's help to maintain and weed the sidewalk gardens outside our property. We appreciate the marketing and promotion to families that is offered through newsletters, social media, sidewalk banners, events, and other activities. We want to be part of the OAA because this will benefit our business as well as the entire commercial corridor.

Thank you.

Regards,

Johnny

Johnny L. Wong

Leung, Louie, Ip & Co.
2515 Ocean Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

ph 650-992-3003, x109
fax 650-992-3003 or 650-731-7422
www.llicocpa.com

Click Here to send us files securely

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
This communication and any accompanying documents are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee. If you receive this transmission in error, you are advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance upon this communication is strictly prohibited. Moreover, any such disclosure shall not compromise or waive the attorney-client, accountant-client, or other privileges as to this communication or otherwise. If you have received this communication in error, please contact me at the above email address.

From:	wy Y
To:	MelgarStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChenStaff; jacquline.hazelwood@sfgov.org
Cc:	uniackemj@hotmail.co; Winso. On
Subject:	Fwd: Ocean Ave Association "Taxes"
Date:	Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:59:46 PM

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

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **wy Y** <dragonflysfo@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, May 27, 2025, 2:09 PM
Subject: Ocean Ave Association "Taxes"
To: <chenstaff@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

Mayor Lurie
Supervisors of San Francisco

District 11
Ms. Chen,

Please address why my address: 248 Harold Ave,94112 is included in
this "Ocean Avenue Association" property assessment and possible tax implications on my property tax?
I have owned this house and its deed since 2010 and NEVER was it stated in my DEED of this Association Assessment to Tax my Property on top of the City Property Tax I already pay!
My house is neither on Ocean Ave or Zone Commercial and is Single Family Zone.
As a Senior Citizen living in already high property tax City, I dont need any more levied property taxes for this type of HOA or ASSOCIATION or Whatever they label themselves to be!
The City and County of San Francisco is my Primary Address and Home and I never agreed to joining this Association!
Please address this matter with the Mayor and other Supervisors that voted for this measure to repeal and know that it is SHAMEFUL to ALLOW some Association to involuntarily add more assessments or taxes or whatever additional property fees to our Property without our permission!....its like allowing Subletting this Association from the City of San Francisco!...This is CRAZY and UNFAIR and VIOLATES MY PROPERTY RIGHTS!

Chris Wong
248 Harold Ave
415-503-7629

From: COPY EDGE Printing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Rosendo Betancourt
Subject: Renewal Ocean Ave Assoc
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:44:48 PM

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

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: bos@sfgov.org

RE: Ocean Avenue Association (OAA)

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am writing to you in support of renewal of the Ocean Avenue Association (OAA). Their role in our neighborhood has played a vital role in keeping our streets clean, inviting and thriving.

The OAA has helped small businesses on Ocean Avenue on many levels. The OAA ambassadors keep our streets inviting with daily street trash pickups and graffiti removals. The special events they organized promote and celebrate the viticultures in our neighborhood. These events introduce old and new patrons to our business services and products. Plus, they assist on grants and government relating issues such as regulation requirements have been instrumental for many minority businesses in the past years. The people at OAA are always ready to help and they do it with a smile, too.

For these reasons, the OAA should be allowed to continue its work.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Gin

THANK YOU.
Reminder to Customer: Please download the files sent from Copy Edge to your own devices within 2 days. After 2 days, the email files will be deleted from our system.
Store Hours: Monday to Friday 9am - 4pm | Saturday & Sunday CLOSED

COPY EDGE printing
1508 Ocean Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112
Store: 1 (415) 587-5345
Email: CopyEdgePrinting@gmail.com

Blueprint Copy . Banners . Posters . Envelopes . Postcards . Flyers . Cards & More

From: Larry Dorsey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Ocean Avenue Association public comment July 8,2025
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:40:19 PM

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

Hello my name is Larry Dorsey and I am a board member of OAA. First I would like to say Welcome Back San Francisco! It's wonderful to see clean streets, tourists and public safety making San Francisco " the city by the bay"vibrant again.
As part of this beautiful city is the Ocean Avenue Community which has been faithfully served by OAA for many years. We clean the streets, embrace street artists to beautify the corridor, work hand in hand with our public safety partners as well as the business owners to keep Ocean Avenue safe and enjoyable for the community and patrons.
We are committed to being part of the revitalization of the city! We've made great strides under the current leadership of OAA and would like to continue to contribute to this unique and wonderful city! With that said, WELCOME TO OCEAN AVE…WE'RE OPEN FOR BUSINESS!

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

From: wy Y
To: ChenStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); jacquelin.hazelwood@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Challenge of Renewal to Ocean Avenue Association renewal to include residential properties
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:54:06 PM

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

To: City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Supervisor of District 11, Ms. Chen
Supervisor of District 7 , Ms. Melgar

We the "Residential Properties from 2 Geneva to 248 Harold Ave, Protest and Vote Strongly against our Residential Properties to Ocean Ave Association CBD Renewal adding Property Tax Assessment and Increase in Property Taxes to affected Residential Zoned Properties!
This is UNFAIR and WRONG to include residential properties that DO NOT BENEFIT from OAA supplemental services for the Businesses along Ocean Ave!
We have and continue to take care of our own properties just like majority of Residential Properties of the City and County Of San Francisco!
To incur even Additional Property Taxes on TOP OF ALREADY HIGH PROPERTY TAXES for City and County Services Already Provided!
This is DOUBLE TAXATION without Representation and Voting of the Whole Districts 7 and 11 that border Ocean Ave CBD!...If that was done, be assured this Assessment and Voting would BE VOTED DOWN >>>FULL STOP!!
Ocean Ave Association CBD Benefits Everyone that shop and Live nearby, so should we have a "Usage Tax" added to their purchases from OAA CBD Commercial Stores and Services???.....NO WAY that would FLY!!!
This measure is an "Overreach and money grab by OAA like an HOA fees/taxation"!
Especially this Residential Block of Ocean Ave is a "Side Street from the Main Ocean Ave" ...and we cant even get "Street Sweeping or Parking Restrictions" on this parallel side street that many cars both of residents and nonresidents take advantage of this "No Restrictions" on Parking....We have City College, Muni Transit Terminal, and Balboa Park Bart Station that vehicles figure out to "Park for Free and No Street Sweeping, No Residential Restrictions" so they park for weeks and months, till we constantly have to report to 311 and Parking Enforcement to Cite vehicles parking over 72 hrs!...".We do that Reporting and Cleaning of this parallel side street of Ocean Ave" ....and there is a "Storm Drain" in corner of this side street that gets clogged up with "Trash" and do you think the City or OAA cleans up this area from clogging?...NO, WE DO THAT on our own VOLUNTEER Basis, because the CIty has refused to schedule Street Sweeping even with repeated reporting ,they just give some BS EXCUSES that the Street Sweeping Truck cannot fit in that AREA!.....REALLY???....No Problem for Recology Trucks etc. to come in Weekly!
Again we refute and challenge OAA to IMPOSE PROPERTY INCREASE TAXES for SERVICES we do not or will not benefit and we are not COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES on ZONED RESIDENTIAL PARCELS!!

Especially my property at 248 Harold Ave, is not ADDRESSED TO OCEAN AVE!!
My Front Facing Home is on Harold Ave...only my fenced off backyard with retaining walls

faces Ocean Ave!
Shall we also include any Residential Parcels that faces Ocean Ave or uses Ocean Ave to transit and shop there?....like mention before are we "Creating an HOA Type management within the City/County of San Francisco???....This is CRAZY, I bought this Single Family House and Residential Zoned Property before OAA was Formed, and now they want to include my residential property that is not even addressed to Ocean Ave or is a Business be added to its 15 Year Renewal of OAA CBD???
No..NO NO....I will and my residential neighbors that have been added to this UNFAIR ASSESMENT ASSOCIATION will Take All Legal Means to Litigate and REMOVE our Residential Parcels from this Scam OAA CBD Proposal!
If not RECTIFIED ASAP, OAA and the CITY will have to ANSWER to the COURTS!

Did you know the Executive Director,Christian Martin is not only the Director of Ocean Ave Association but of Soma West Community Benefit District (CBD) earning salary of over $200K + compensation, OAA salary not disclosed (interesting)??
This shows "Conflict of Interests" in managing and deploying CBDs in San Francisco and his resume shows previous CBD Executive positions in Trenton,New Jersey (TDA)...
This needs to be INVESTIGATED and CITY should Limit multiple CBD Executive Positions as CONFLICT OF INTERESTS and Possible SCAM of TAX PAYERS $$$$

Ingleside Neighbors, District 11
Chris Wong
248 Harold Ave
415-568-8298
dragonflysfo@gmail.com

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Notice of public hearing no 250371
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 1:47:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from a member of the public regarding File No. 250371.

File No. 250371: Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on July 8, 2025, at 3:00 p.m., to consider renewal and expansion of a property- based business improvement district, known as the Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District, pursuant to the California Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994 (Streets and Highways Code, Sections 36600 et seq.), and City and County of San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, Article 15; scheduled pursuant to the Resolution No. 208-25 contained in File No. 250368; adopted on May 6, 2025.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Wil <wilfrancis@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Crayton, Monique (BOS) <monique.crayton@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of public hearing no 250371

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

To the board of supervisors.

I'm writing in regards to your notice of public hearing file no 250371.

First and foremost it's a complete joke and BS that you post a notice of said hearing on June 27th for a meeting scheduled for July 8th. This is exactly how corruption and deception work. It's criminal and morally and ethically WRONG.

I'm a property owner on Ocean avenue and my family has owned it for over 70 years.

You schedule a meeting with little to no notice on a subject that causes property owners a new tax!

It's obvious by the meeting and the time line that the vote failed and you now rush a meeting so no one can make the meeting, ecspecially those that live outside the city. You send the notice out on a Friday afternoon and only allow for 7 business day before said meeting.

It’s no wonder the city of San Francisco and the state of California have become a joke and laughing stock accross America.

This is shotty business practice at its best and yet another example of manipulation and colution to get what you want, with out proper notice and timelines for those effected to make plans to attend.

And you do it in alignment with one of the busiest summer holiday weeks there is. Many of us were and are out of town celebrating our independence. Only to arrive home to see mail in our box that eliminates us from attending due to the slimy approach of the city. It’s actions like this that create friction and cause miss trust of government officials!!

To impose a tax on property owners with out representation is complete corruption and a violation of civil rights.

Their was no time for any interested parties to be “heard”., IE : Me.

From my perspective this is wrong, slimy and corrupt!!!

We already pay taxes to the city of San Francisco to do everything that is outlined in your 4 bullet points. To creat a tax to impose such garbage is criminal in every aspect.

My vote has always been, a hard , NO. and will continue to be a no!

Maybe you should focus your time and energy into parts of the city you’ve allowed to become the use of urinals and feces on public streets and property.

Yet again you target the hard working tax paying citizen for yet another ridiculous grab into their pocket book.

Property owner of 1799
Ocean avenue!

530-949-7978

Item 20

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Ms. Somera and Ms. Calvillo: Please post On-Line — Fwd: Board File 250728: Support of Resolution Urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to Resolve Contract Dispute
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 1:26:00 PM
Attachments:	Pull Quote Testimony to Board of Supes 25-07-05.png Testimony to Board of Supes Supporting Resolution 250728 UCSF Health vs Blue Shield 25-07-05.pdf Testimony to Board of Supes UCSF Health vs Blue Shield 25-06-30.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Patrick Monette-Shaw regarding File No. 250728.

> **File No. 250728:** Resolution urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to resolve dispute regarding reimbursement for medical services and treatment by renewing their contract, thereby continuing to preserve members' ability to access crucial healthcare services. (Dorsey, Melgar, Fielder, Sauter, Chan, Mahmood, Chen)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

-------- Forwarded Message --------

Subject: Board File 250728: Support of Resolution Urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to Resolve Contract Dispute
Date: Sat, 5 Jul 2025 21:58:07 -0700
From: pmonette-shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>
Reply-To: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net
To: Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org, Connie.Chan@sfgov.org, Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org, Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org, Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org, Joel.Engardio@sfgov.org, Bilal.Mamood@sfgov.org, Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org, Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org
CC: 'Angela Calvillo' <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>, daniel.lurie@sfgov.org, david.chiu@sfgov.org, Rey.Guillen@sfgov.org, Frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org, Calvin.Yan@sfgov.org, Angelina.Yu@sfgov.org, Robyn.Burke@sfgov.org, Amy.Lee5@sfgov.org, Tita.Bell@sfgov.org, Tomio.Nagano@sfgov.org, Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org,

Madison.R.Tam@sfgov.org, Bryan.Dahl@sfgov.org, Dominica.Donovan@sfgov.org, Mahanaz.Ebadi@sfgov.org, Jennifer.Fieber@sfgov.org, Emma.Heiken@sfgov.org, Jen.Low@sfgov.org, Michael.Farrah@sfgov.org, holly.lopez@sfgov.org

Patrick Monette-Shaw
975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

July 5, 2025

The Honorable Raphael Mandelman, Board President
The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, Supervisor, District 11
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Board File 250728: Support of Resolution Urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to Resolve Contract Dispute

Dear Board President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

I fully support the Resolution introduced by Supervisor Matt Dorsey in Board File #250728 urging the University of California Health System and Blue Shield of California to resolve their contract dispute affecting City employees' and retirees' access to health insurance. This first "*Further Resolved*" statement on page 2 of Resolution needs clarification

As you know, it is highly unusual for City employees and retirees to face termination of their healthcare insurance during the middle of any contract year. As it is, Blue Shield threatened to terminate this contract— initially by July 10, that has now been extended to August 9, 2025 — just over six months into Plan Year 2025 (the first year of its three-year contract), after Blue Shield was awarded the contract commencing on January 1, 2025.

As the Board of Supervisors may recall, San Francisco's Health Services System discontinued the Blue Shield of California MAPD (Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug) plan effective December 31, 2016 and HSS transferred Plan members to the UnitedHealthcare MAPD plan on January 1, 2017. Here we are now eight years later, and the new contract with Blue Shield has again become a problem.

The Board of Supervisors approved the current three-year contract with Blue Shield of California in 2024, and as such it is the responsibility of this Board of Supervisors to protect City employees' and City retirees' access to their healthcare choices made during Open Enrollment in 2024.

But it is also the mayor's job. Mayor Lurie is also responsible for what's going on with our retiree healthcare benefits, since many retirees worked for 20 to 30 years for the City expecting their benefits would be protected. As such, Mayor Lurie needs to do right by City retirees, and also help negotiate an end to this contract dispute. Mayor Lurie can do so using his bully pulpit as Mayor, and advocate with both California Governor Gavin Newsom and the University of California Board of Regents to intervene and resolve this contract dispute.

There are reports that a handful of University of California campuses may be preventing reaching a contract settlement with Blue Shield. Since Governor Newsom appoints 18 members of the U.C. Board of Regents, and since Governor Newsom, Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis, Speaker of the Assembly Robert Rivas, and Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond are all ex-officio members of the Board of Regents, additional state-level resources should be engaged in helping to resolve this contract dispute.

This first "*Further Resolved*" statement on page 2 of Resolution is unclear, and needs clarification. It states:

> "*FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges, in the event that no long-term resolution between Blue Shield and UC Health is possible, that the parties at minimum commit to preserve existing services for the remainder of the plan year, and provide certainty of future benefits for the 2026 plan year in time for Open Enrollment*;"

It's not clear what "*preserving existing services for the remainder of the plan year*" means. Does that mean just through December 31, 2025? And while the Resolution calls for "*continuity of future benefits for the 2026 plan year*," it's not clear whether that mean through December 31, 2026. And what does it mean "*in time for open enrollment*"? Does that suggest that the Health Service System will re-negotiate with other insurance companies

this fall to replace the Blue Shield of California plan, in the event Blue Shield is **NO**T going to include UCSF Health facilities into 2026?

The Board of Supervisors must do more to insure Blue Shield and the UCSF system reach a settlement that does not degrade retiree health care under the contract you approved based on promises made to retirees and active City employees.

The Health Service System and the Board of Supervisors must intervene, in part to make sure UCSF Health patients continue to receive their continuity of care services, and maintain their caregivers of choice. If they seek care from a provider that accepts Medicare, the Health Services System needs to ensure these plan members that Blue Shield will pay the difference in our out-of-pocket and out-of-network co-pay costs.

It is somewhat re-assuring that our City Attorney may explore legal remedies for the City and plan members if Blue Shield doesn't reach a contract extension with UCSF Health. I strongly support Supervisor Dorsey's interpretation that it may potentially amount to a breach of contract. And again, I would support the City Attorney's opinion if he concludes Blue Shield's conduct is actionable, or grounds for contract suspension or debarment as a City contractor.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to amend this Resolution by directing Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to also send a copy of this Resolution to Governor Newsom, Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis, Assembly Speaker Rivas, and Superintendent Thurmond.

I also urge the Board of Supervisors to unanimously pass this Resolution today. I ask that the Board also take any additional steps to resolve this contract quickly, and in favor of City employees and City retirees.

The healthcare of current City employees and City retirees must not be jeopardized!

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Patrick Monette-Shaw
Reporter and Columnist
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Daniel Lurie, Mayor of San Francisco
David Chiu, City Attorney
Rey Guillen, Director, San Francisco Health Service System
San Francisco Health Service System Board

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Protect Our Benefits
RECCSF

Patrick Monette-Shaw
975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

July 5, 2025

The Honorable Raphael Mandelman, Board President
The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, Supervisor, District 11
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

"Mayor Lurie needs to do right by City employees and retirees. He also needs to help negotiate an end to this contract dispute. Mayor Lurie can do so using his bully pulpit as Mayor to advocate with both California Governor Gavin Newsom and the University of California Board of Regents to intervene and resolve this contract dispute."

Board File 250728: Support of Resolution Urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to Resolve Contract Dispute

Dear Board President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

I fully support the Resolution introduced by Supervisor Matt Dorsey in Board File #250728 urging the University of California Health System and Blue Shield of California to resolve their contract dispute affecting City employees' and retirees' access to health insurance. This first "*Further Resolved*" statement on page 2 of Resolution needs clarification

As you know, it is highly unusual for City employees and retirees to face termination of their healthcare insurance during the middle of any contract year. As it is, Blue Shield threatened to terminate this contract— initially by July 10, that has now been extended to August 9, 2025 — just over six months into Plan Year 2025 (the first year of its three-year contract), after Blue Shield was awarded the contract commencing on January 1, 2025.

As the Board of Supervisors may recall, San Francisco's Health Services System discontinued the Blue Shield of California MAPD (Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug) plan effective December 31, 2016 and HSS transferred Plan members to the UnitedHealthcare MAPD plan on January 1, 2017. He

The Board of Supervisors approved the current three-year contract with Blue Shield of California in 2024, and as such it is the responsibility of this Board of Supervisors to protect City employees' and City retirees' access to their healthcare choices made during Open Enrollment in 2024.

But it is also the mayor's job. Mayor Lurie is also responsible for what's going on with our retiree healthcare benefits, since many retirees worked for 20 to 30 years for the City expecting their benefits would be protected. As such, Mayor Lurie needs to do right by City retirees, and also help negotiate an end to this contract dispute. Mayor Lurie can do so using his bully pulpit as Mayor, and advocate with both California Governor Gavin Newsom and the University of California Board of Regents to intervene and resolve this contract dispute.

There are reports that a handful of University of California campuses may be preventing reaching a contract settlement with Blue Shield. Since Governor Newsom appoints 18 members of the U.C. Board of Regents, and since Governor Newsom, Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis, Speaker of the Assembly Robert Rivas, and Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond are all ex-officio members of the Board of Regents, additional state-level resources should be engaged in helping to resolve this contract dispute.

This first "*Further Resolved*" statement on page 2 of Resolution is unclear, and needs clarification. It states:

> "*FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges, in the event that no long-term resolution between Blue Shield and UC Health is possible, that the parties at minimum commit to preserve existing services for the remainder of the plan year, and provide certainty of future benefits for the 2026 plan year in time for Open Enrollment*;"

It's not clear what "*preserving existing services for the remainder of the plan year*" means. Does that mean just through December 31, 2025? And while the Resolution calls for "*continuity of future benefits for the 2026 plan year*," it's not clear whether that mean through December 31, 2026. And what does it mean "*in time for open enrollment*"? Does that suggest that the Health Service System will re-negotiate with other insurance companies this fall to replace the Blue Shield of California plan, in the event Blue Shield is **NO**T going to include UCSF Health facilities into 2026?

The Board of Supervisors must do more to insure Blue Shield and the UCSF system reach a settlement that does not degrade retiree health care under the contract you approved based on promises made to retirees and active City employees.

The Health Service System and the Board of Supervisors must intervene, in part to make sure UCSF Health patients continue to receive their continuity of care services, and maintain their caregivers of choice. If they seek care from a provider that accepts Medicare, the Health Services System needs to ensure these plan members that Blue Shield will pay the difference in our out-of-pocket and out-of-network co-pay costs.

It is somewhat re-assuring that our City Attorney may explore legal remedies for the City and plan members if Blue Shield doesn't reach a contract extension with UCSF Health. I strongly support Supervisor Dorsey's interpretation that it may potentially amount to a breach of contract. And again, I would support the City Attorney's opinion if he concludes Blue Shield's conduct is actionable, or grounds for contract suspension or debarment as a City contractor.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to amend this Resolution by directing Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to also send a copy of this Resolution to Governor Newsom, Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis, Assembly Speaker Rivas, and Superintendent Thurmond.

I also urge the Board of Supervisors to unanimously pass this Resolution today. I ask that the Board also take any additional steps to resolve this contract quickly, and in favor of City employees and City retirees.

The healthcare of current City employees and City retirees must not be jeopardized!

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Patrick Monette-Shaw
Reporter and Columnist
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Daniel Lurie, Mayor of San Francisco
David Chiu, City Attorney
Rey Guillen, Director, San Francisco Health Service System
San Francisco Health Service System Board
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Protect Our Benefits
RECCSF

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

June 30, 2025

The Honorable Raphael Mandelman, Board President
The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, Supervisor, District 11
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

UCSF Health and Blue Shield of California Contract Dispute Threatens City Employee and City Retiree Healthcare Continuity

Dear Board President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

As the Board of Supervisors must surely know, San Francisco City employees and retiree's face an urgent and extended contract dispute between Blue Shield of California and UCSF Medical Group/UCSF Health, which will end insurance coverage on July 10, 2025 and disrupt continuity of care to thousands of City employees and City retirees.

If an agreement between Blue Shield and UCSF Health isn't reached, UCSF will become an out-of-network provider for Blue Shield of California members, and all Medicare plans offered or administered by Blue Shield, including Medicare Advantage plans, will be affected.

To help balance Mayor London Breeds' proposed Fiscal Year 2024—2025 and FY 2025–2026 budgets, the Board of Supervisors approved a three-year contract between Blue Shield of California and the Health Services System, including a preferred provider Medicare Advantage Plan for retired City and County retirees. The San Francisco Health Service System promised retirees the Blue Shield plan would be essentially equivalent to the previous UnitedHealthcare Medicare Advantage plan, and would provide uninterrupted, continued access to UCSF medical services and physicians as in-network healthcare provider.

It is somewhat ironic that Blue Shield is blaming this contract impasse on UCSF Health pursuing higher reimbursement rates. After all, during the Health Service Board contract negotiation and bidding process in June 2024, Blue Shield failed to provide guaranteed rate increase caps for Plan Years 2026 and 2027. It's entirely conceivable that Blue Cross may dramatically increase plan rates for Years 2026 and 2027 of the three-year contract, and that the Mayor and San Francisco might not realize the budget savings Mayor Breed was seeking to balance the proposed FY 2024–2025 and FY 2025–2026 City budgets. So now, while Blue Shield quibbles about UCSF Health seeking higher reimbursement rates, Blue Shield itself may end up increasing its rates!

Of concern to consumers is that Blue Shield created an entity called Ascendiun Inc., which is now its out-of-state corporate parent company. Blue Shield accrued a surplus of more than $4 billion over the decades as it benefited from its former tax-exempt status. Blue Shield's restructuring with Ascendiun incorporated in Delaware calls into question whether it is reinvesting enough of its profits to lower its rates, better serve low-income residents, and provide coverage for underserved areas in the state of California. Blue Shield's decision to establish an out-of-state parent company is very troubling.

The Health Services Board needs to keep monitoring the guaranteed rate increase caps issue to document whether the migration from UnitedHealthcare to Blue Shield in January 2025 actually saved the City money!

Unfortunately, the Health Services System's Board — in its role as fiduciaries of health insurance plans for City of San Francisco's employees and retirees — inexplicably cancelled it's July monthly meeting, coincidentally also scheduled for July 10, 2025. Just when plan members needed the Health Service System's Board the most to step in and help facilitate resolution of this contract dispute, the HSB went missing in action. This is totally unacceptable. The Board of Supervisors should intervene and urge the HSB to rapidly schedule a special meeting.

The Board of Supervisors must become involved now to insist Blue Shield and the UCSF system reach a settlement that does not degrade retiree health care under the contract you approved based on promises made to retirees and active City employees.

Although UCSF Health has asserted that members seeking care at St. Francis and St. Mary's are not affected by this contract dispute with Blue Shield and can continue to see any provider, hospital, or medical facility that accepts Medicare, we are worried that if we elect care at UCSF Health facilities, we may also face higher co-payments at an out-of-network facility.

The Health Service System and the Board of Supervisors must intervene, in part to make sure UCSF Health patients continue to receive their continuity of care services, and maintain their caregivers of choice. If they seek care from a provider that accepts Medicare, the Health Services System needs to ensure these plan members that Blue Shield will pay the difference in our out-of-pocket and out-of-network co-pay costs.

It is somewhat re-assuring that our City Attorney may explore legal remedies for the City and plan members if Blue Shield doesn't reach a contract extension with UCSF Health. I strongly support Supervisor Dorsey's interpretation that it may potentially amount to a breach of contract. I would support the City Attorney's opinion if he concludes Blue Shield's conduct is actionable, or grounds for contract suspension or debarment as a City contractor.

The healthcare of current City employees and City retirees must not be jeopardized!

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Patrick Monette-Shaw
Reporter and Columnist
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Daniel Lurie, Mayor of San Francisco
David Chiu, City Attorney
Rey Guillen, Director, San Francisco Health Service System
San Francisco Health Service System Board
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Protect Our Benefits
RECCSF

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: PLEASE LISTEN TO A STORY ABOUT CITY RETIREE SUFFERING COMPOUNDED BY THE LOSS OF UCSF HEALTH CARE!/Subject: Re: Martha"s story
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:19:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Art Persyko regarding File No. 250728, which is Item No. 47 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250728:** Resolution urging University of California Health and Blue Shield of California to resolve dispute regarding reimbursement for medical services and treatment by renewing their contract, thereby continuing to preserve members' ability to access crucial healthcare services. (Dorsey, Melgar, Fielder, Sauter, Chan, Mahmood, Chen, Sherrill)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Arthur Persyko <artpersyko3@sonic.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: PLEASE LISTEN TO A STORY ABOUT CITY RETIREE SUFFERING COMPOUNDED BY THE LOSS OF UCSF HEALTH CARE!/Subject: Re: Martha's story

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

My friend, Martha Hawthorne, is a retired SF city worker and SEIU 1021 member whose physical suffering is being compounded by her inability to get continuity of care and expertise from her doctors and other health care workers at UCSF because of the change in health care insurance coverage imposed on her and thousands of other SF city worker retirees.

I visited each of your offices last week on behalf of Protect Our Benefits to make the case for finding a resolution of this dire situation that affects over 40,000 retirees who devoted their work lives to seeing the public on behalf of the City and County of SF.

Please read the forwarded email below that Martha Hawthorne sent me to share with all of you; and then please redouble your efforts to ensure that she and other SF city worker/retirees get access to the UCSF health care they so desperately need and were promised.

Sincerely, Art Persyko, SF California Alliance for Retired Americans Action Team convener (650-228-4188).

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Martha Hawthorne** <martha222@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 1, 2025 at 2:34 PM
Subject: Re: Martha's story
To: Art Persyko <artpersyko@gmail.com>

I am currently suffering from unbearable Right sided severe sciatica pain caused by a 1.1 cm synovial cyst lodged in the Lumber 4 vertebrae and pressing on the R L4 nerve root.I have Blue Shield PPO and have been told that there is not assurance this would be covered, due to the ongoing negotiations, and coverage ending July 10, ONE DAY
BEFORE this procedure. Furthermore, if the procedure is not successful i will need spinal surgery, ALSO AFTER JULY 10.

This puts me and thousands of others in a terrible place, not knowing if we will be able to get the life saving treatment, procedures and surgery we need. There are no other places which can provide continuity of care and the very specialized medical expertise I and others need.

Please don't leave me in the lurch; I love and appreciate my doctors, my sympathy is with them!!!!!

Item 21

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject: FW: Our Zoo - Gaining Independence
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:31:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Kim Forwood regarding File No. 241027, Motion No. M24-125.

File No. 241027, Motion No. M24-125: Motion directing the Budget and Legislative Analyst to conduct a comprehensive performance and management audit of the San Francisco Zoo for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2024-2025 and 2025-2026. (Melgar, Safai, Chan)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

-----Original Message-----
From: leo811 (kim) <leo811sf@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 12:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Our Zoo - Gaining Independence

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

Hello Supervisors, Connie, Myrna, et all,

Here is today's post to my Zoo related blog that I hope you have become familiar with.

More to come, as I unpack the reports on Tanya's resignation.

Have a Safe holiday,
Kim Forwood

Our Zoo - Gaining Independence

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://iamnotananteater.blogspot.com/2025/07/our-zoo-gaining-independence.html___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiNWIxNjBkNjZmZWIzMTI4YzZjNjVlODg4MWE2YWZhMTo3OmY2NmQ6ODJmMjVjNGFhZWMzODFkYmEzNDQ4ZTY2NjZiNDVmNGQyMzA4OGZjNDA3OTMzMTcyZmM4MTI1ZWJiNWMxNDA5YjpwOkY6Tg

This Week Our Zoo Gained Independence

Hoping the Future of Our Zoo is Free from... Tyranny, Dictatorship, & Mismanagement that has worked to destroy it, for too long.

Meta AI

i am NOT an anteater!

... musings from my san francisco zoo visits



"Personal Opinions and Facts presented publicly are Not against the law or any rules. ... Censorship and Retaliation Actions in an attempt at Suppression are frowned upon by Healthy Societies."
- Kim aka leo811

MY OPINIONS, LIKE IT OR NOT.

"Everything written in this blog is based on My Personal Experience. Things I see and hear myself. Research I've done myself. These are My Opinions. You may not agree with them, you

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 2025

Our Zoo - Gaining Independence

The timing for current Zoo Director Tanya Peterson's Resignation, could only have been better had it happened years ago. Preferably before she kept Our Orangutans living in caged tubes for two years.

The news of Peterson's not soon enough departure next month, coinciding with Independence Day, is fitting.

Our Zoo has been saddled with her mass mismanagement for seventeen years. It has seen extreme abuse of power. Tanya ran rampant through Our Zoo. There is so much that could be noted, but in my opinion, the worst has been her treatment of all Living Beings. She refused to listen to experienced advice from Animal Care Staff, causing a wide range of welfare issues to Our Animal Residents. She terrorized and threatened Staff, creating low morale, and forcing longtime dedicated Animal Care Staff to leave.

As I said, there is so much more. The saddest part of watching what has happened every step of the way, is that none of it had to happen. There didn't need to be this contention. Unfortunately, that is what happens when someone asserts their self-entitlement.

WORDS TO LIVE BY ...

"Never, never be afraid to do what's right, especially if the well-being of a person or animal is at stake. Society's punishments are small compared to the wounds we inflict on our soul when we look the other way."
-Martin Luther King Jr.

"Many people, especially ignorant people, want to punish you for speaking the truth. For being correct. For being you. Never apologize for being correct, or for being years ahead of your time. If you're right and you know it, speak your mind. Speak your mind. Even if you are a minority of one, the truth is still

Item 22

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Letter of Objection: AT&T Monopole at 350 Amber Drive (Diamond Heights Community Association)
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 3:41:00 PM
Attachments:	DHCA - 350 Amber Dr ATT Monopole [OBJECTION] SF Clerk Board of Supervisors.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Daniel Schereck regarding a proposed AT&T Wireless Macro Telecommunications Services pole at 350 Amber Drive.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Daniel Schereck <danielschereck@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Objection: AT&T Monopole at 350 Amber Drive (Diamond Heights Community Association)

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

Hi Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

My name is Daniel Schereck and I live at 5610 Diamond Heights Blvd, Apt C102, San Francisco, CA 94131.

As the President of the Diamond Heights Community Association, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to share the attached letter from the community in opposition to the proposed 104’ tall AT&T WTS monopole & facility proposed at the San Francisco Police Academy at 350 Amber Drive.

Our Association has debated this topic thoroughly and the Board of Directors has voted to oppose the project.

I've recently spoken with Anh Ha, Legislative Aide to Rafael Mandelman, who mentioned I should send the letter to you and that you can deliver it to the Board of Supervisors.

I appreciate your time and consideration with this matter and hope you're having a lovely day,

Daniel Schereck
(831) 277-9930
danielschereck@me.com

July 3, 2025

Daniel Schereck
President, Diamond Heights Community Association
5610 Diamond Heights Blvd, Apt C102
San Francisco, CA 94131
(831) 277-9930

RE: 104-foot tall monopole for a new AT&T Wireless Macro Wireless Telecommunications Services (WTS) Facility adjacent to the San Francisco Police Academy at 350 Amber Drive (2024-004318CUASHD)

Dear Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

I am the President of the Diamond Heights Community Association (DHCA). On behalf of the Association, I'm writing to oppose the 104-foot tall AT&T WTS facility and monopole.

Association home owners and residents range from recent arrivals to those who have lived in Diamond Heights for decades. All of us have at least one thing in common: we've chosen to live in Diamond Heights because of a combination of its safety, natural beauty, mid-century modern architectural charm, and the absence of massive, imposing high-rise commercial facilities.

Association members' personal concerns and opposition include but are certainly not limited to the following:

1. Outreach to residents—especially adjacent to and within direct line-of-sight of the proposed 104-foot tall monopole and equipment—has been horribly insufficient and bordering on non-existent other than the utterly minimal posting of incomplete 1-page notices along a sidewalk of Amber Drive that virtually no-one in the neighborhood could see. The DHCA reasonably expects a larger and far better good-faith-effort to engage with neighborhood residents on a project of this scale.

2. Giant monopoles and WTS facilities like the ones AT&T is proposing are frequently seen as extremely undesirable to prospective homeowners. This hammers property values and results in direct financial harm particularly to homeowners living adjacent to and/or within direct line of sight of them. AT&T's profits can't be built on the backs of Diamond Heights residents and homeowners.

3. The 104-foot monopole will irreparably harm the beautiful aesthetics and cherished views of Diamond Heights renters and homeowners alike. This is especially true for homeowners of Diamond Heights Village along Duncan Street, and homes along Amber Drive & Diamond Heights Boulevard. Entire communities will be forced to stare at this monstrosity every time they look out their windows or exit their homes. Those of us who do our shopping at Safeway, Walgreens and other businesses in the shopping center just to the south of the proposed monopole will literally never be able to escape it since it will be visible from all directions at all times from *many* parts of Diamond Heights.

4. The tower is a monster and completely out of place. Its overbearing and oppressive components comprise an offensive list of additions to what *shouldn't even be a commercial skyline* in Diamond Heights: a massive monopole rising well above the local tree canopy, 12 panel antennas, 9 remote radio units and 3 mounted surge suppressors; not to mention a large telecommunications facility, cabinets, GPS units mounted to outdoor equipment, and a massive 30kW DC generator with a shocking and polluting 190 gallon DIESEL fuel tank on a concrete pad.

5. The presence of a high power WTS facility with its horrific 190 gallon DIESEL generator next to a grove of dry trees—including highly combustible leaves, branches, undergrowth and eucalyptus in the neighboring Glen Canyon Park—are of grave concern to residents due to fire risks should the facility's equipment malfunction or spark. The location of this project is simply too risky.

The harm to and lack of consideration for those of us who live in Diamond Heights are unacceptable. We object to the AT&T WTS facility and monopole completely and demand that it not be built.

Daniel Schereck
President, Diamond Heights Community Association

Item 23

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: 4th of July Sunset Dunes Park
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 3:45:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from James Patterson regarding fireworks at Sunset Dunes.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: James Patterson <centermid526837@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 4, 2025 9:57 PM
To: Joel Engardio <jengardio@gmail.com>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: 4th of July Sunset Dunes Park

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

Could any of you please explain why we continue to have illegal fireworks throughout Subset Dunes Park?
Please check with your 311 and 911 operators to get the timeline of events.
I started to call around 7pm.
Used app- no help
Called 311 - no help
Called police non emergency- no help
Finally called 911 - made report it is now 9:52 pm and we still have multiple explosions going off all throughout Sunset Dunes Park!

Could have used a couple of units stationed out here with drones. You could make arrests or cite people participating!

Every year since I’ve lived here since 1968 always happens like clock work.
I hope everyone of you gets voted out.
James Scott Patterson
D4 resident
Democrat
Recall Engardio!

Item 24

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Concerns Regarding the Comfort Women Statue in San Francisco
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 3:51:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Yamamoto Yumiko regarding File No. 171070, Resolution No. 415-17.

> **File No. 171070, Resolution No. 415-17:** Resolution retroactively authorizing the San Francisco Arts Commission to accept a gift of art, entitled The "Comfort Women's" Column of Strength, valued at $190,000 and accept and expend a donation from the "Comfort Women" Justice Coalition of $208,000 for the purpose of maintaining the artwork, entitled the "Comfort Women's" Column of Strength, for a period not less than 20 years. (Kim, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: info@i-rich.org <info@i-rich.org>
Sent: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: japaninfo@sr.mofa.go.jp
Subject: Concerns Regarding the Comfort Women Statue in San Francisco

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

CC: San Francisco Consulate-General of Japan

Dear San Francisco Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

I am Yumiko Yamamoto, the director of “The International Research Institute of Controversial Histories,” a Japanese civil organization dedicated to researching human rights histories and promoting international understanding and cooperation.

Our Institute would like to bring to your attention that comfort women statues have been at St. Mary's Square in San Francisco since 2017, and many Japanese continue to oppose the statues.

We understand that the statues were proposed by Korean and Chinese civil groups. Their motivations behind this initiative seem more aligned with political agendas than with the empowerment of women and the promotion of peace.

We believe that the inscriptions on the plaque are not grounded in historical fact.

While the civil groups assert that the comfort women were victims of sexual slavery who were forcibly taken away and abused, there is no historical evidence or primary documentation to substantiate their claims. Scholars and researchers, including those from Japan, Korea, and the U.S.A., have pointed out the inaccuracies in these narratives.

Has the presence of the statues meaningfully improved women's rights in San Francisco? Has it benefited your citizens in any way?

For many Japanese individuals, the statues have negatively affected the image of San Francisco, being perceived as an act of discrimination and hostility towards the Japanese.

We urge you to refrain from engaging in anti-Japan political campaigns, as the comfort women issue does not directly concern your community.

We will continue to demand the removal of the statues.

Director YAMAMOTO, Yumiko
International Research Institute of Controversial Histories (iRICH)
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://en.i-

rich.org/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpiMDRkYzE2MWNiZjcyN2UwZThkMzA4NjBkNDY2OTViOTo3OmQwNDY6ZDhkNmUxZDNiMmVlYTI3Mjk2MTkxYWM1MWYyYWYzNTIyMzk3ZjY4MzFhNmZkNmI0OTNjOWRjNDAwNzk5YzBlZDp0OkY6Tg

address: 2F 2-6-3, Suido Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-005 JAPAN
phone: +81-3-6912-1045
e-mail: info@i-rich.org

Item 25

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Cruise LLC - Supplemental WARN Notice
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 3:54:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png Cruise LLC - Supplemental WARN Notice to California.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Cruise, submitting a supplemental WARN Act Notice.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Janet Gogna <janetgogna@gbgllp.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 12:31 PM
To: EDD WARN Notice <WARNNotice@edd.ca.gov>; Gouvaia, Jennifer@EDD <Jennifer.Gouvaia@edd.ca.gov>; Warn Notice (ECN) <Warn.Notice@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; business@novaworks.org <business@novaworks.org>; supervisor.lee@bos.sccgov.org <supervisor.lee@bos.sccgov.org>; mayorklein@sunnyvale.ca.gov <mayorklein@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Cruise LLC - Supplemental WARN Notice

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

Hello:

Please see attached Supplemental WARN Notice. A copy has been sent to you via first class mail.

Janet Gogna

Janet Gogna · Legal Secretary
janetgogna@gbgllp.com
(T) 415.603.5013 • (F) 415.840.7210

www.gbgllp.com • 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 840, San Francisco, CA 94111

This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

cruise

July 3, 2025

VIA US MAIL and EMAIL

WARN Act Coordinator
Statewide Services Unit
Workforce Services Division
Employment Development Department
722 Capitol Mall, MIC 69/Room 3099
Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov

Jennifer Gouvaia
Deputy Chief, Program and Technical Assistance Section
CA Employment Development Department
Workforce Services Branch
Workforce Services Division
722 Capitol Mall (MIC 50)
Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: Jennifer.Gouvaia@edd.ca.gov
Email cc: eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov

Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Executive Director, OEWD
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: warn.notice@sfgov.org

Mayor Daniel Lurie
Office of the Mayor
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: daniel.lurie@sfgov.org

Supervisor Matt Dorsey, District 6
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: DorseyStaff@sfgov.org

Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: WaltonStaff@sfgov.org

Marlena Sessions, Executive Director
NOVAworks Workforce Development Board
456 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
Email: business@novaworks.org

Supervisor Otto Lee, District 3
70 West Hedding Street
East Wing, 10th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Email: Supervisor.Lee@bos.sccgov.org

Mayor Larry Klein
City Hall
456 W. Olive Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
408-730-7232
Email: mayorklein@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Re: Supplemental Notice - Additional Employee Separations

cruise

On February 4, 2025 Cruise LLC ("Company") notified you that it had decided to permanently downsize both its operations and its remote operations at the following locations:

- San Francisco 1st Office Location, located at 333 Brannan Street, San Francisco, CA 94017 (District 6)
- San Francisco 2nd Office Location, located at 1201 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94013 (District 6)
- San Francisco 3rd Office Location, located at 640 Cesar Chavez Street; San Francisco, CA 94124 (District 10)
- San Francisco 4th Office Location, located at 175 Sylvester Road, South San Francisco, CA 94080 (District 5)
- Sunnyvale Office Location, located at 840 W California Avenue, Sunnyvale CA 94086 (District 3)

The Company previously anticipated that approximately 739 California Employees would be permanently laid off and these employees were provided with such notice on February 4, 2025 (the "Event"). The Company provided supplemental notices that additional California employees would be permanently laid off and provided notice of such on the below dates:

- February 21, 2025 - 26 California employees
- February 28, 2025 - 6 California employees
- March 19, 2025 - 15 California employees
- April 1, 2025 - 2 California employees
- April 16, 2025 - 24 California employees
- May 20, 2025 - 22 California employees
- May 30, 2025 - 1 California employee

This supplemental notice is to inform you—pursuant to any possible obligation under the federal and California Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Acts (collectively "WARN")—that the number of affected employees has increased beyond what was previously reported.

It is anticipated that an additional 101 California employees will be permanently laid off and provided notice of such on July 3, 2025. The impacted employees will remain on payroll for the 60 day notice period. The employees do not have the right to displace or bump any other Company employee. None of the employees are represented by a union.

Attached is an anticipated list with the locations, the job titles of the positions to be affected and the additional number of the individuals who are expected to be impacted by job title.

cruise

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at ashley.hogue@gm.com.

Very truly yours,

CRUISE LLC

By: Ashley Hogue, Director, Global People & TA Operations, Systems, Governance

cruise

ATTACHMENT

1201 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94013 (District 6)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Assistant General Counsel	1
Associate Software Engineer	1
Director II, Strategy & Analytics	1
Director, Electronic Engineering	1
Distinguished Applied Scientist	1
EHS Specialist	1
Executive Business Partner	1
Global Security Area Manager	1
Hardware Engineer	1
Lead Paralegal	2
Manager II, Applied Scientist	2
Manager II, EHS	1
Manager II, Hardware Engineering	1
Operations Senior Coordinator	1
Principal Software Engineer	2
Senior Applied Scientist	2
Senior Applied Scientist II	1
Senior Field Service Launch Technician	1
Senior Hardware Engineer	1
Senior Manager, Facilities	1
Senior Manager, Program Management	1
Senior Managing Counsel	1
Senior Optical Sensor Engineer II	2
Senior Optical Test Engineer, II	1
Senior Troubleshooting Engineer	1
Sensor Technician Lab Manager	1
Staff Hardware Engineer	3

cruise

1201 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94013 (District 6)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Staff Optical Sensor Engineer	2
Staff Product Operations Manager	1
Staff Program Manager II	1
Staff Systems TLM	1
Technical Operations Senior Engineer II	1

Remote Workers attached to 1201 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94013 (District 6)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Accounting Manager II	1
Applied Scientist	1
Benefits Program Manager	1
Director, Global Security Operations	1
Director, HRBP	1
Engineering Manager	1
Engineering Manager II	1
Global Security Area Manager	1
Global Supply Manager, Indirect Procurement	1
Lead Counsel	2
Manager II, Optical Sensor Engineering	1
Manager, Global Security Operations	1
Senior Applied Scientist	1
Senior Attorney	1
Senior Director, Compensation	1
Senior Director, Government Relations	1
Senior Executive Assistant II	1
Senior Machine Learning Engineer	1
Senior Machine Learning Engineer II	3
Senior Manager, Accounting	1

cruise

Remote Workers attached to 1201 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94013 (District 6)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Senior Manager, People Analytics and Workforce Planning	1
Senior Managing Counsel	2
Senior Software Engineer	2
Senior Staff Applied Scientist	1
Senior Staff Compensation Partner	1
Senior Staff HR Business Partner	1
Senior Staff Optical Sensor Engineer TLM	1
Senior Staff Technical Program Manager	1
Senior Systems Engineer	2
Staff Contingent Workforce Program Manager	1
Staff Executive Business Partner	1
Staff HR Business Partner	1
Staff ML Systems Engineer	1
Staff Program Manager	1
Staff Software Engineer	1
Supply & Procurement Staff	2
Systems Engineer	1
Technical Learning & Development Senior Coordinator	1

640 Cesar Chavez Street; San Francisco, CA 94124 (District 10)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Manager, Technician Lead	1
Vehicle Technician II	1

840 W California Avenue, Sunnyvale CA 94086 (District 3)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Director, Machine Learning	1
Principal Applied Scientist	1

cruise

840 W California Avenue, Sunnyvale CA 94086 (District 3)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Principal Systems Engineer	1
Senior Applied Scientist	1
Senior Audio Visual Technician II	1
Senior Manager, Business Systems Engineering	1
Senior Optical Sensor Engineer II	1
Senior Product Operations Manager II	1
Staff Applied Scientist	1

Remote Workers attached to 840 W California Avenue, Sunnyvale CA 94086 (District 3)	
Job Title	Additional No. of Affected Employees in Job Title
Senior Business Systems Engineer II	1
Senior Product Operations Manager II	1
Senior Staff Applied Scientist	1
Senior Workday Prism Developer II	1
Staff Software Engineer	1

Item 26

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Preserve the Community-Built Benches in the Mission
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:52:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Rishav Rout regarding benches in the Mission district.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Rishav Rout <rout.rishav@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:39 AM
To: DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: Preserve the Community-Built Benches in the Mission

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

Dear Department of Public Works and Elected Officials,

I'm writing as a Mission District resident who has personally used the community-built benches installed by the San Francisco Bay Area Bench Collective. These benches provide a vital, dignified place to rest—especially for seniors, people with disabilities, and those of us waiting for the bus in a neighborhood where public seating is sorely lacking.

These benches are not a blight; rather, they are acts of care. I've seen people use them gratefully, whether catching their breath, waiting for transit, or simply existing in public space with a little more comfort.

Rather than removing these benches, I urge Public Works to collaborate with the Bench Collective and our elected officials to create a permitting or legalization program—similar to

what the City of Richmond recently passed. Richmond's approach strikes a thoughtful balance between community initiative and public oversight, and San Francisco should follow suit.

Our city already has frameworks for integrating grassroots infrastructure, such as parklets and shared streets. Why not apply the same creative governance here?

Removing these benches would send the wrong message to those of us trying to improve our neighborhoods through hands-on civic engagement. I urge you to preserve the benches, and work toward a path that ensures safety, accessibility, and respect for community-built infrastructure.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Rishav Rout (he/him)
Mission District Resident
rout.rishav@gmail.com

Item 27

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	222 Letters regarding File No. 250609
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:16:00 AM
Attachments:	222 Letters regarding File No. 250609.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 222 letters regarding File No. 250609, which is Item No. 32 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250609:** Ordinance authorizing the City to reallocate approximately $34,777,000 in prior appropriated revenue and unappropriated earned interest within the Our City, Our Home ("OCOH") Fund, to allow the City to use revenues from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax through Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 for certain types of services to address homelessness, notwithstanding the expenditure percentages set forth in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810; where future revenue and interest to the OCOH Fund exceeds amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, authorizing the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional revenues and interest on any programs to address homelessness as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810, without regard to the expenditure percentages in that section; temporarily suspending the limit on funding for short-term rental subsidies; and finding that these reallocations are necessary to achieve the purposes of the Our City, Our Home Fund pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2811. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Jeffrey Hunt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:47:01 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hunt
San Francisco

Jeffrey Hunt
jeffnhunt@gmail.com
154 Wood Street, Apt. 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jeffrey Hunt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:46:56 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hunt
San Francisco

Jeffrey Hunt
jeffnhunt@gmail.com
154 Wood Street, Apt. 4
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Wren Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:18:38 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Wren Murphy
ldevonnemurphy@gmail.com
190 Paloma Ave

Pacifica , California 94044

From: James Finora
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:08:11 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

James Finora
jamesfinora@gmail.com
1471 15th st

San Francisco , California 94103

From: Andrea Yeager
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:04:04 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Andrea Yeager
Youth Services Librarian

Andrea Yeager

andysou05@yahoo.com
498 BENTON AVE
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Hunter Kippen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Reconsider Prop C changes
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:34:40 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

As far as I understand it, this would remove a historic requirement for the board of supervisors to approve Prop C funding allocations by a super majority vote, given that voters understood that prop C funds are a juicy target for austerity measures.

The removal of the supermajority requirement undermines the will of the voters and is undemocratic. Our city is one of rich history and the source of many activist movements. By allowing for Mayor Lurie to grab power in this way, you are betraying that spirit. I urge you to strongly reconsider. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for listening

Sincerely,

Hunter

Hunter Kippen
hunterkipt@gmail.com

1631 19th St
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Jean Rouly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:57:41 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jean Rouly
michel@rouly.net
1395 22nd St Apt 217

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Aubrey King
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:00:26 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Aubrey King
agatesking@gmail.com
540 O'Farrell Street, Apt 202

San Francisco, California 94102

From: Madhuri Mudaliar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:42:48 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Madhuri Mudaliar
mmmudaliar1998@gmail.com
2951 Bush Street

San Francisco, California 94115

From: Juhi Gupta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:56:44 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Juhi Gupta
juhig01@gmail.com
2540 McAllister St

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Leah Baron
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:52:09 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Leah Baron
leahbaron00@gmail.com
47A Delmar St

San Francisco, Ca, Connecticut 94117

From: Shanti Singh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please reject Section 4 and preserve the will of SF voters / critical housing funds
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:51:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I think we are all aware that funding for affordable housing, including permanent supportive housing, is an exceedingly precious resource in a fiscal and political environment that our federal administration has made more hostile than ever before in our living memory. The voters of San Francisco authorized Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018), on the basis that any substantive reallocation, including reallocation away from housing, would require supermajority approval from the Board.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C:

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote, and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of ALL voter-approved citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

Section 4 is a grave disservice to the people of San Francisco who voted for these funds to be allocated to specific purposes, and an equally grave disservice to the people who the voters want Prop C to help -- people who need permanent homes and don't have any right now. Please toss Section 4 in the dustbin where it belongs.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

In solidarity,

Shanti Singh
shanti.priyasingh@gmail.com
1441 Clay St. Apt #10
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Maya de Paula Hanika
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:57:02 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Maya de Paula Hanika
mayahanika@gmail.com
376 DOLORES ST

SAN FRANCISCO, 94110

From: Mary Singer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:06:03 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Singer
jordlewis101@gmail.com
88 Crestline Drive #12

San Francisco , California 92131

From: Graham Galloway
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:57:13 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Graham Galloway
graham@gallowayfamily.org
399 Arguello Blvd A

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Helen Chan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Do Not Remove the Supermajority Requirement in Prop C!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:51:49 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Helen Chan

Helen Chan

xeroxahippo@gmail.com
1900 Sutter St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Brittany Hewett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:24:53 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):
I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

I would also like state that I am fundamentally against penalizing people for living in RVs. Just because the rich cannot fathom these as homes, should not mean that people are dehumanized. I WILL die on this hill

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Brittany

Brittany Hewett
hewettb22@gmail.com
63 bronte st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: TJ Holsman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:24:10 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TJ Holsman
tjholsman@gmail.com
3140 21st St #102

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Ashley Risso
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:15:25 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Ashley Risso

Ashley Risso
ashleyrisso@gmail.com

1587 15th St, Apt 502
San Francisco, California 94103

From: zachbalian@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:06:26 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A concerned San Francisco resident

zachbalian@gmail.com

55 Junior Terr
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Laurie Wen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:02:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laurie Wen
lauriepwen@gmail.com
319 Precita

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Laura Saunders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:01:53 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laura Saunders
tolsaunders@yahoo.com
170, King St

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Catriona Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:42:26 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Catriona Miller

Catriona Miller

catrionasmiller@gmail.com
1767 Hayes st
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Isabella Rivera-Gonzalez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:41:24 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Isabella Rivera-Gonzalez
ositotoast@gmail.com
546 Naples St.

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Krista Keegan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:39:38 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Krista Keegan
kkeegansf@gmail.com
4225 23rd Street

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Richard Carini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:20:57 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard Carini
rdcarini@gmail.com
1520 Pershing Dr

San Francisco, California 94129

From: teresa cullen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:16:19 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

teresa cullen
teresa.amelia.cullen@gmail.com
885 25th Avenue, Apt 104

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Calvin Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:14:19 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Calvin Gee
calving314@gmail.com
3125 Laguna St.

San Francisco, California 94123

From: Dave Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:55:08 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors, Aides, and Clerks:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dave Madden
actionnetwork@davemadden.org
164 Everson St

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Allyson Ochoa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:53:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Allyson Ochoa

Allyson Ochoa
ochoa_allyson@yahoo.com

1475 18th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Katherine Weltzien
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:50:05 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

As a District 1 voter, I have enthusiastically supported Supervisor Chan’s candidacy in past elections and her actions regarding this issue will have strong influence in my future voting decisions.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Katherine

Katherine Weltzien
kmweltzien@gmail.com
584 12th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Andrew White
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:50:05 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew James White

Andrew White

metaphysicalrainixi@gmail.com
1388 Haight St PMB 155
San Francisco, California 94117-2909

From: Emily Coady
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor from Undermining Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:39:50 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Emily Coady

Emily Coady
ejocoady@gmail.com
952 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Cheryl Meeker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:29:07 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

This is a call to keep the mayor from undermining our important BOS direct democracy!!!

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Meeker

cherylmeeker@gmail.com
1296 HAIGHT ST Apt 28
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Matt Alvarez-Nissen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:11:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Matt

Matt Alvarez-Nissen
matt.nissen1@gmail.com

19B Noe St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Sara Marston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:53:28 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Sara Marston (Dogpatch/Central Waterfront)

Sara Marston
sarammarston@gmail.com
2660 3rd St, Apt 309

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Robert Arnold
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Prop C funds for permanent housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:34:31 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Arnold
notwork@rdacolor.com
257 Richland ave

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Adam Egelman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:11:35 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Adam Egelman

Adam Egelman
a@adam.social

575 Cole St Apt 309
san Francisco, California 94117

From: Erin Lim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:00:35 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Erin Lim
erinlim77@gmail.com
154 Wood Street #4

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Kristian Mitchell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:58:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Kristian Mitchell

Kristian Mitchell
0_samples_owing@icloud.com

355 Fulton St, 207
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Stephen F. Trull Jr.
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:55:54 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen F. Trull Jr.
stephen.f.trull.jr@gmail.com
849 Haight Street

San Franciscoo, California 94117

From: Rachelle Derouin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:55:54 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Rachelle Derouin
Sunset Resident

Rachelle Derouin

rachellederouin6@gmail.com
1354 LA PLAYA ST
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Monica Berini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:46:36 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am a longtime San Francisco D11 resident who also works near Civic Center. I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Monica Berini
mberini@pm.me

651 Morse Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From:	Jacqueline Patton
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Prop C funding!
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 5:38:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing you regarding Prop C, which I personally canvassed for to provide housing for San Francisco residents. I am strongly urging you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Jacque

From: Alexei Pacholuk
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab, Maintain Checks and Balances
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:36:31 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alexei Pacholuk

Alexei Pacholuk

lexpach@gmail.com
1249, 14th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Christopher Cornell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:26:24 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Christopher Cornell
christopher.n.cornell@gmail.com
801 Baker Street, Apt 16

San Francisco, California 94115

From: Katherine Scott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:19:55 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Katherine Scott
katherineascott@gmail.com
3033 Rivera St

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Deena Blumenkrantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:19:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Deena Blumenkrantz
deenab7@gmail.com
1523 Funston Ave

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Carlos Ciudad-Real
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:17:00 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Carlos Ciudad-Real
cmciudadreal@gmail.com
1222 Harrison St Apt 1203

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Peter Carr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop Attacking the Unhoused - Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:50:31 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Peter Carr

Peter Carr
petercarr1123@gmail.com

740 Parnassus Ave, unit 14
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Peter Carr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop Attacking the Unhoused - Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:50:28 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Peter Carr

Peter Carr
petercarr1123@gmail.com

740 Parnassus Ave, unit 14
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Jordan Wasilewski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff
Subject:	Don"t Embezzle Prop C Funds
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 4:42:10 PM

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

Dear Bastards, Bootlickers, and Boomers

I urge you to kill Item 32 tomorrow and send it straight to hell. Speaking as a person who was a signatory to a ballot argument in favor of Prop C of November 2018, I supported this because it would focus on what matters most, that the solution to homelessness is a home and we need services to make sure people are successfully housed, and that should never, ever change just because of angry Twitter populism.

I see you want to take funding away from housing and give it to shelter, and then complain that advocates for Housing First aren't being "pragmatic". Maybe if you weren't so stupid and/or corrupt, you would know that a) the reason it is so hard to get new PSH is because the city is so focused on acquiring fixed site housing, that they haven't tried expanding their scattered site program, and b) expanding PSH still creates turnover in the shelter system allowing more people to get off the street. Its not fucking rocket science.

If we focus only on shelter, then our unhoused neighbors will languish there. Then what? Gatekeeping? As someone who is autistic, I know that if there wasn't housing first, I would never get housed because I struggle with eye contact or some other ABA bullshit like that. And trans people have their own nightmares in shelter, which is maybe why Lurie was booed at Trans March.

Lastly, I did not flee New Jersey just for New Jersey to come here. Prop C is a trust fund for solving and preventing homelessness, and New Jersey is the only other place where it is seemingly acceptable for politicians to raid trust funds (my dad was a state worker, and would often rant about how corrupt state government was). In most other places, you would be jailed for something like that.

This legislation is an embezzlement of funds We The People voted for. Anybody who votes for this is a corrupt embezzler who doesn't care about having power to help their constituents and who should do the Budd Dwyer.

I yield my time, fuck you,

-Jordan

From: Ciaran Trevino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:35:17 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ciaran Trevino
ciaranrtrevino@gmail.com
256 Willard North

San Francisco, 94118

From: Alecia Burley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:29:51 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alecia Burley
87-odder-purines@icloud.com
2278 30th Ave

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Alecia Burley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:29:49 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alecia Burley
87-odder-purines@icloud.com
2278 30th Ave

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Abdul Latif Islam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:19:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Abdul Latif Islam
lukestreetwalker777@gmail.com
3415 Geary Blvd

San Francisco , California 94118

From: Abdul Latif Islam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:19:19 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Abdul Latif Islam
lukestreetwalker777@gmail.com
3415 Geary Blvd

San Francisco , California 94118

From: Albert Schaffer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:15:07 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Albert Schaffer

Albert Schaffer

albert.schaffer12@gmail.com
200 Carl St Apt 304
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Albert Schaffer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:15:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Albert Schaffer

Albert Schaffer

albert.schaffer12@gmail.com
200 Carl St Apt 304
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Alex Perrotti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:13:52 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Alex Perrotti

Alex Perrotti
alexperrotti@gmail.com

175 Red Rock Way
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Alex Perrotti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:13:51 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Alex Perrotti

Alex Perrotti
alexperrotti@gmail.com

175 Red Rock Way
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Dina Saba
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:13:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dina Saba
sabamdina@gmail.com
1630 Sanchez Street

San Francisco , California 94131

From: Dina Saba
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:13:11 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dina Saba
sabamdina@gmail.com
1630 Sanchez Street

San Francisco , California 94131

From: Clara Liang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:13:09 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Clara Liang
clbliang@gmail.com
317 cornwall st

san francisco , California 94118

From: Noah Levitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:12:39 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Noah Levitt
nlevitt@gmail.com
154 Trumbull St

San Francisco, California 94112-1653

From: Noah Levitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:12:34 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Noah Levitt
nlevitt@gmail.com
154 Trumbull St

San Francisco, California 94112-1653

From: Clara Liang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:11:05 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Clara Liang
clbliang@gmail.com
317 cornwall st

san francisco , California 94118

From: Forrest Hecker-Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:07:14 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Forrest Hecker-Johnson
heckerjohnson87@gmail.com
423 Faxon Avenue

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Forrest Hecker-Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:07:12 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Forrest Hecker-Johnson
heckerjohnson87@gmail.com
423 Faxon Avenue

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Rachel Wood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:06:39 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Rachel Wood
rachelnwood@gmail.com
141 7th Avenue

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Rachel Wood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:06:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Rachel Wood
rachelnwood@gmail.com
141 7th Avenue

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Eric Yuen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:04:27 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric Yuen
ericyuensutter@gmail.com
25 Elgin Park Apt #2

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Eric Yuen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Please Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:04:26 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric Yuen
ericyuensutter@gmail.com
25 Elgin Park Apt #2

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Bridget Bertrand
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:04:05 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As our elected officials your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

I rent in SF and I run a business here.
Please uphold democracy!

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bridget Bertrand
bridget.therapy@gmail.com
75 moss #9
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Bridget Bertrand
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:04:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As our elected officials your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

I rent in SF and I run a business here.
Please uphold democracy!

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bridget Bertrand
bridget.therapy@gmail.com
75 moss #9
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Timothy Workman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:03:20 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Timothy Workman
tim.workman.rulit@gmail.com
858 Filbert St Apt 3

San Francisco, California 94133

From: Timothy Workman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:03:14 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Timothy Workman
tim.workman.rulit@gmail.com
858 Filbert St Apt 3

San Francisco, California 94133

From: Eliza Mcgowen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eliza Mcgowen
elizamcgowen@gmail.com
1725 Noe st

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Eliza Mcgowen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:40 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eliza Mcgowen
elizamcgowen@gmail.com
1725 Noe st

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Regina Islas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:35 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Regina Islas
regina.islas@gmail.com
105 Lake St, Apt 12

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Regina Islas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:31 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Regina Islas
regina.islas@gmail.com
105 Lake St, Apt 12

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jing Yee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:24 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jing Yee
msjingyee@gmail.com
145 Judah st apt 1

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Jing Yee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jing Yee
msjingyee@gmail.com
145 Judah st apt 1

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Karl Dray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:19 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Karl Dray
dsasf@karldray.com
2141 26th St Unit 202

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Joseph Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:13 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wang
joew10@yahoo.com
1087 Capitol Ave

San Francisco , California 94112

From: Karl Dray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:11 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Karl Dray
dsasf@karldray.com
2141 26th St Unit 202

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Joseph Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:10 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wang
joew10@yahoo.com
1087 Capitol Ave

San Francisco , California 94112

From: Karla Ortiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:10 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Karla Ortiz
kortizart@gmail.com
195 7th street

San Francisco, 94103

From: Gaelan Spor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:09 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gaelan Spor
gaelanmckeown@gmail.com
76 Alpha Street

San Francisco, California 94134

From: Karla Ortiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:05 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Karla Ortiz
kortizart@gmail.com
195 7th street

San Francisco, 94103

From: Gaelan Spor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:02:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gaelan Spor
gaelanmckeown@gmail.com
76 Alpha Street

San Francisco, California 94134

From: Samuel Thorpe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:43 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Sam Thorpe

Samuel Thorpe
sam.t.thorpe@gmail.com

185 Burnside Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Samuel Thorpe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Sam Thorpe

Samuel Thorpe
sam.t.thorpe@gmail.com

185 Burnside Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Bailey Hudson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:33 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bailey Hudson
baileyehudson12@gmail.com
191 Frederick St, 33

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Bailey Hudson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:28 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bailey Hudson
baileyehudson12@gmail.com
191 Frederick St, 33

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Charlie Fredrick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:03 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Charlie Fredrick
charliefredrick83@gmail.com
310 Rutledge St

San Francisco, California 94110-5231

From: Charlie Fredrick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:01:03 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Charlie Fredrick
charliefredrick83@gmail.com
310 Rutledge St

San Francisco, California 94110-5231

From: T Flandrich
To: Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject: Item #32. File Nr 250609 Please Reject and honor our votes
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:54:21 PM

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

July 6, 2025
Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):
"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. The removal of the

supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk.
The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for listening to our voices today.
Sincerely,
Theresa Flandrich
District 3 resident

From: Dominic Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:22:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dominic Ryan
38_today_peel@icloud.com
1300 Irving Street

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Thomas Ladendorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:03:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Tom Ladendorf

Thomas Ladendorf
tladendo@gmail.com

4111 1/2 24th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Thomas Ladendorf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:03:18 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Tom Ladendorf

Thomas Ladendorf
tladendo@gmail.com

4111 1/2 24th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Samantha Malpiedi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: please protect the will of voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:56:33 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018), which would be a major departure from the provisions of Prop C.

As a resident of District 8 and a San Franciscan who voted for Prop C, I am very fearful of losing the requirement of a supermajority vote to change any Prop C allocations. I was thrilled to vote for Prop C because of the specific funding for long term solutions to homelessness and Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

Please, I urge the Board and Mayor to honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

The Board of Supervisors provides a check and balance to Mayoral power. I am proud to live in a city that has supervisors elected by our various communities to carry out the will of voters. Please do not abandon your responsibility to uphold the democratic process. Please reject this section of the trailing legislation to ensure Prop C remains as voters intended.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Samantha Malpiedi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: please protect the will of voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:56:32 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018), which would be a major departure from the provisions of Prop C.

As a resident of District 8 and a San Franciscan who voted for Prop C, I am very fearful of losing the requirement of a supermajority vote to change any Prop C allocations. I was thrilled to vote for Prop C because of the specific funding for long term solutions to homelessness and Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

Please, I urge the Board and Mayor to honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

The Board of Supervisors provides a check and balance to Mayoral power. I am proud to live in a city that has supervisors elected by our various communities to carry out the will of voters. Please do not abandon your responsibility to uphold the democratic process. Please reject this section of the trailing legislation to ensure Prop C remains as voters intended.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Bill Gallagher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:52:53 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bill Gallagher
william.p.gallagher@gmail.com
550 27th St

San Francisco , California 94131

From: Rachel Clyde
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:49:38 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Rachel Clyde
raclyde959@gmail.com
460 Lyon St, Apt 8

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Gabriel Goffman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:33:27 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Goffman
gfgoffman@gmail.com
273 Frederick

San Francisco , California 94117

From: Stephen Altamirano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:25:29 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Stephen Altamirano

Stephen Altamirano
stephenaltamirano@gmail.com

672 Waller st
San Francisco, California 94117-3321

From: Nishan D"Souza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:16:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Nishan D'Souza
nishand@gmail.com
2805 24th St

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Alexis Ewing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:06:32 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Alexis Ewing

Alexis Ewing
Alexisewing@gmail.com

30 Otis st, 303
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Pete Manning
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:49:40 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Pete Manning
petem@nning.com
63 Bronte Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Pete Manning
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:49:33 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Pete Manning
petem@nning.com
63 Bronte Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Kate Agathos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:46:12 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kate Agathos
kate.agathos@gmail.com
830 Sutter Street

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Kate Agathos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:46:09 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kate Agathos
kate.agathos@gmail.com
830 Sutter Street

San Francisco, California 94109

From:	A. Samson Manalo
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Urging Rejection of Section 4 – Trailing Legislation (File No. 250609) for Prop C
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 1:33:17 PM

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

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to respectfully urge you to **reject Section 4** of the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with *Proposition C: Our City, Our Home* (2018).

Section 4 allows the City to expend future revenues from the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026–27 across eligible homelessness programs, **regardless of the specific percentage allocations mandated by Prop C**—so long as the Board of Supervisors approves the expenditures through the regular budget process.

This is a significant and troubling departure from the original language of Prop C. Voters intentionally required a **supermajority** of the Board to approve any reallocation of funds—an essential safeguard to ensure transparency and accountability. **Section 4 removes that safeguard**, allowing changes to be made with only a simple majority.

This change not only weakens a voter-approved mandate—it also undermines the integrity of the citizen initiative process enshrined in the San Francisco Charter. Previous versions of trailing legislation did not include this provision, and its inclusion now is a serious breach of public trust.

We urge you to honor the will of the voters and **oppose Section 4** of this legislation.

Thank you for your attention and leadership on this issue.

Samson

A. Samson Manalo
Director of Development
415.749.2184
amanalo@hospitalityhouse.org
Pronouns: He/Him

HOSPITALITY HOUSE
"Fighting for the Soul of the City Since 1967"
290 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 |
(415) 749-2100 | fax: (415) 749-2136
Tax ID# 94-6171319 - Invest in our community **here**.
www.hospitalityhouse.org | **Facebook** | **Instagram** | **Flickr** | **YouTube**

Legal Notice: This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Jessie Fernandez
Subject: File No. 250609
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:43:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisor

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

--
Jessie Fernandez (el/he/him)
¡PODER!

From: Max Posse
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:34:46 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Max Posse
hoofbeats0mp@gmail.com
3476 18th St, Apt 23

San Francisco, California 94103

From:	Jegy Sering
To:	Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Cheyanne.Chen@sfgov.org; ChenStaff
Cc:	Oumar Fall; David Canham; Chema Hernández Gil; XiuMin Li; Theresa Rutherford; Nely Obligacion
Subject:	San Francisco Proposition C vote tomorrow (July 8, 2025)
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 10:50:11 AM

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

Dear Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Myrna Melgar, Bilal Mahmood, et al:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Jegy Sering

Field Representative
San Francisco Civic Center Chapter
Department of Public Works (DPW) Chapter
SF Redevelopment Agency Chapter (OCII)

Pronouns: they/them or he/him

SEIU Local 1021
Office Address: 350 Rhode Island St #100
San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct #: (415) 307-9302
Email: jegy.sering@seiu1021.org
Member Resources Center: 1-877-687-1021
Not a member? Member Application

From:	Oumar Fall
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chema Hernández Gil; David Canham; Nicole T. Germain; Kristin Hardy; Arcelia Montoya; Cade Crowell; Carey Dall; Claude Joseph; Daniel Becker; Daniela Gonzalez; Dennis Wong; Derek Arthur; Elizabeth Travelslight; Forrest Kreiss; Genevieve Vigil; Jegy Sering; Jessica Inouye; Khalil Kaid; Michelle Wright; Najuawanda Daniels; Oumar Fall; Sean Brown; XiuMin Li
Subject:	Majority Requirement change at BOS
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 10:07:04 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Oumar Fall

SEIU Local 1021
SF Field Director
Cell: (415) 307-3244
Office: (415) 848-3676
Email: oumar.fall@seiu1021.org

From: Dante Popalisky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:39:45 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dante Popalisky
popaliskyd@gmail.com
813 47th Ave. #2

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Lea McGeever
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Do your fucking job as though you're not a fascist and Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:37:28 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
D6 homeowner, tax paying resident, voter and compassionate human being

Lea McGeever
lea.mcgeever@gmail.com

1095 market st
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Prop C Trailing Legislation (File 250609)
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 12:01:05 PM
Attachments: HANC Prop C Allocation Letter 7-6-25.docx

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

Please consider the attached letter from the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council in regard to File 250609, agenda item 32 for the July 8 Board of Supervisors Meeting.

Thank you,

--Richard Ivanhoe--
President, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

HAIGHT ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Richard Ivanhoe
President

Nate Horrell
Vice- President

Bruce Wolfe
Recording Secretary

James Sword
Corresponding Secretary

Christin Evans
Treasurer

Lisa Awbrey
Nominating Chair

Karen Fishkin
Membership Chair

Calvin Welch
Housing and Land Use Chair

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Tab Buckner
Daneille McVay
Alice Mosely
Jim Rhoads

July 6, 2025

Dear Supervisor:

The Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council is writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 of the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the Authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional revenues or interest among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

By: Richard Ivanhoe, President

PO Box 170518 ✞ San Francisco ✞ CA 94117
www.hanc-sf.org info@hanc.sf-org

From: Win Mixter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 11:16:45 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Win Mixter
action@winmixter.com
76 , Museum Way

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Alex Jaffe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 10:54:13 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alex Jaffe
alex.l.jaff@gmail.com
151 28th Street

San Francisco, Val-de-Marne 94131

From: Terri Saul
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Hello: Respect the Will of Voters!
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:32:07 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Terri Saul
terrisaul@gmail.com
1262 62nd St. Apt B

Emeryville, California 94608

From: Amanda Moore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:06:28 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

It is imperative that you reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform.

Respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Amanda

Amanda Moore
whereisagmoore@gmail.com
2418 van ness ave
san francisco , California 94109

From: mengyun liu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:01:14 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mengyun Liu

mengyun liu

g_taroo@hotmail.com
1448 rhode island street
san francisco , California 94107

From: Megan Luby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 6:35:12 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Megan L

Megan Luby
meganluby@yahoo.com

949 Hayes St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Robert Ramirez-Monaco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 5:15:14 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Monaco
District 8

Robert Ramirez-Monaco
rjmich73@gmail.com
1170 GUERRERO ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Stephanie Kuyper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 10:07:30 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor Chan,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Kuyper

Stephanie Kuyper
skuyper11@gmail.com

1514 PERSHING DR
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94129

From:	Reuben Alvear
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Prop C
Date:	Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:59:20 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-Reuben

From: Geoff Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:40:49 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Geoff Smith
geoff.gordon.smith@gmail.com
363 Texas St

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Jessa Silver
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: PLEASE Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:14:50 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jessa Silver

Jessa Silver

jlsilver21@hotmail.com
55 BOARDMAN PL APT A
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Leah Martin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:08:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Leah Martin
leahedwinamartin@gmail.com
389 VALENCIA ST

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Joseph Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Honor the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 8:21:11 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wang
joew10@yahoo.com
1087 Capitol Ave

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Patricia De Iarios
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 8:16:40 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Patricia De Iarios
pasmada662@gmail.com
1130 Filbert St

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Ian Hewitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 7:43:22 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ian Hewitt
ianrhewitt@gmail.com
238 San Carlos Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Marth Goldin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 7:33:49 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

The voters passed the super majority requirement in Prop C for a reason - to assure that the funds were spent as intended, not to allow the mayor to appropriate them.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Marth Goldin
honmgret@gmail.com
701 4th Ave
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Mary Scheib
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 6:58:13 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Scheib
maryscheib17@gmail.com
970 Duncan St

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Laura Goldin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 6:48:52 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I write to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This materially alters the provisions of Prop C. Voters - your constituents - specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by allowing reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the express intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laura Goldin
lgsplace@gmail.com
701 4th Avenue

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Maria Goretti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:56:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Maria Goretti
mgoretti@hotmail.com
515 Lombard Street

San Francisco , California 94133

From: AA AA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:52:07 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

AA

AA AA

jedi06.bloom06@gmail.com
1000 PACHECO ST
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Jordan Niell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:41:33 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jordan Niell
jniell13@gmail.com
1386 47th Ave

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Gowri Nayar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters and Stop Further Marginalization of the Unhoused!!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:01:34 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gowri Nayar
nayargowri@gmail.com
1580 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco , California 94115

From: Jennifer Lynch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Prop C: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:59:03 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Lynch
jenniferlunch@gmail.com
257 Richland Ave

San Francisco, California 94110-5841

From: Heather Hughes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:47:55 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Heather Hughes
heatherhoneypot@gmail.com
858 Page St

SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: Michelle Vilardi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:39:46 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michelle Vilardi

Michelle Vilardi

mish0319@aol.com
351 21st Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Rachel Speckenbach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:35:47 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Rachel Speckenbach

Rachel Speckenbach
rspeck3@gmail.com

540 Scott St, Apt 1
San Francsico , California 94117

From: Claire Baker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:29:49 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Claire Baker
clairesbaker2@gmail.com
1138 Alabama st

San Francisco, California 9411”

From: Andrew Kent
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:05:47 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Kent
andrew.kent.90@gmail.com
10 Moss Street Apt A

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Wolcott Katzenbach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 3:52:54 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Wolcott Katzenbach
wkatzen@gmail.com
696 2nd Ave.

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Alexandra Barreneche
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 3:45:58 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Barreneche
alexbarreneche@gmail.com
696 2ND AVE

San Francisco, California 94118

From: claravpinsky@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 3:45:27 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

claravpinsky@gmail.com
2238 Market St #403
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Nahiel Nazzal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 3:37:19 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Nahiel Nazzal

Nahiel Nazzal
nahiel.s.nazzal@gmail.com

2600 Santiago st
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Yolanda Porrata
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 2:21:25 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisors

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Yolanda Porrata
yolanda@verasf.com
1785 15TH ST

San Francisco, Veracruz de Ignacio de la Llave 94103

From: Cade Crowell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 2:16:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Cade Crowell

Cade Crowell
cade.crowell@gmail.com

1515 Pine St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Alyssa Julian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 2:09:36 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Alyssa J

Alyssa Julian
alyssamjulian1@gmail.com

768 9th ave
San Francisco , California 94118

From: Mary Bugsrin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 2:04:05 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Bugsrin
maria.bugarin7@gmail.com
1130 Filbert Street

San Francisco, California 94109

From: Amy Androw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:24:24 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Amy Androw

Amy Androw
amy.androw@gmail.com

1585 Waller St Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Francisco Harvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:18:38 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Frankie Harvey

I want to add that it feels like a personal betrayal to retroactively change the allocation of resources from what was clearly intended by the voters. It's bad enough to reprioritize

sweeping people away rather than helping them, but longer-term, you're seriously damaging peoples' faith in the democratic process. Future leaders will be able to reallocate vital resources straight into their own pockets or those of their friends, and this will be the method they use and the precedent they point to when justifying it. Does anyone's vote count when politicians have the ability to cross out what's next to the filled-in ballot bubble and retroactively write in whatever they'd like? If voters are really this powerless, perhaps our City is hopeless after all.

Francisco Harvey
franciscoharvey230@gmail.com
535 Clayton St., Apt. A
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Katie Kwon-Brossman
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Reject Section 4 of Prop C
Date:	Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:08:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters

and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Katie Kwon-Brossman | 415-350-7323

From: sf_district6@yahoo.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:46:23 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement significantly alters previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation, representing a major departure from the foundational principles that guided its development. This change not only undermines the clear intent of voters who participated in the democratic process but also sets a concerning precedent that jeopardizes the integrity of all citizen initiatives within the city. By disregarding this critical element, the Board and Mayor risk eroding public trust in the system designed to empower citizens. It is imperative that they honor the will of the voters, as well as uphold the citizen initiative process that is enshrined and protected in the San Francisco Charter, ensuring that the voices of the community are not only heard but also respected and acted upon in good faith.

As Supervisors, your duty is to provide a necessary check on Mayoral power, ensuring that the balance of governance is upheld within our democratic system. To relinquish this critical responsibility would be a significant failure of the obligations you were elected to perform and would undermine the very principles of accountability and representation that guide our city’s administration. We urge you to uphold the integrity of the democratic process, honor the voices of the voters who supported Prop C, and firmly reject this section of the trailing legislation, which seeks to diminish the authority vested in your role. It is essential that you

stand firm in your commitment to the electorate and protect the rights and interests of the community you serve.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

In sincere solidarity, we stand together, united in our shared values and commitment to supporting one another through every challenge we face.

sf_district6@yahoo.com
PO BOX 420782
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94142-0782

From: Alanis Suarez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:35:17 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alanis Suarez
alanisksuarez@gmail.com
1714 15th St

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Cayla A Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:27:06 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Cayla A Lewis
cayla.ann.lewis@gmail.com
340 Church Street

San Francisco, California 94114-4703

From: Evan Sutton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:26:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Mayor Lurie and Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Evan

Evan Sutton

evan@thesuttonfamily.com
4 Fairoaks Ct.
San Mateo, California 94403

From: Melinda Huot
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:14:32 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Melinda
D5

Melinda Huot

melhuot@gmail.com
317 scott st
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Alex Gray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:10:50 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Alex Gray
Brentwoodgray@gmail.com
345 Brentwood Avenue

San Francisco, California 94127

From: Kevin Garske
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:05:12 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Kevin

Kevin Garske
ktmgarske@gmail.com

1239 35th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Kyle Laser
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:52:14 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kyle Laser
kaylayser@gmail.com
652 STANYAN ST

SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: Christopher Mika
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:50:44 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Christopher Mika
mika.christopher@gmail.com
Geary St.

San Francisco , California 94109

From: Maria Ellman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:46:09 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Maria

Maria Ellman
mgellman92@yahoo.com

533 2nd Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Tina Tran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:45:41 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tina Tran
tinamichelletran@gmail.com
460 FELL ST

San Francisco, California 94102

From:	Marquitta Collins
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	REJECT Legislation File No.250609
Date:	Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:42:26 AM

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

Hello!
Stand on the Right Side of Democracy ! Respect the Voters!
I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):
Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.
This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.
The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.
We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

From: Jeremy Llewellyn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 6:59:51 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor Bilal Mahmood:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Llewellyn
jeremy.llewellyn@gmail.com
1445 waller st

san francisco, California 94117

From: Tom Lane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 4:22:42 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tom Lane

Tom Lane

indoors81byroads@icloud.com
790 Page St Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94117

From: John Ramirez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 4:09:20 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I live in district 8, Supervisor Mandelman's district.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
John Ramirez.

John Ramirez
johnramirez8001@gmail.com
1170 Guerrero St. , apt. 307
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Keith Hardaway
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 12:28:18 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Keith Hardaway

Keith Hardaway
keithhardaway1@gmail.com

2173 California Street, 103
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Brittany
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Standup for the unhoused community and Prop C
Date:	Friday, July 4, 2025 11:02:18 AM

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

Dear Supervisors Chen, Melgar, and Mahmood,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Brittany
District 2 Resident

From: Teresa Palmer
To: MahmoodStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: PLEASE Reject removal of supermajority on changing Prop C -(File No. 250609
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 12:43:17 AM

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

Date July 4 2025

PLEASE Reject removal of supermajority on changing Prop C -(File No. 250609)

In tegards to: July 8 hearing

(File No. 250609)

Dear Supervisor Mahmood

I, a D5 constituent, am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate

safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer MD

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco 94117

teresapalmer2014@gmail.org

From:	Claudia Leung
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation for Prop C!
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 10:45:43 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Warmly,

Claudia Leung

From: ariane.electra@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Please reject Section 4!!
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 9:02:05 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear supervisor Mandelman,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
District 8

ariane.electra@gmail.com
725 Buena Vista Ave W

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Chris Lamkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:48:24 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Chris Lamkin
cjlamkin64@gmail.com
600 25th Ave

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Louise Desmarchelier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:46:27 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Louise Desmarchelier
loul.desm@gmail.com
625 Powell Street

San Francisco, California 94108-3050

From: clara liang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:36:02 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Clara

clara liang
clbliang@gmail.com

317 cornwall st
san francisco , California 94118

From: Mira Ingram
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Protect Essential Homeless Family Housing Funds
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 5:27:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you,

Mira Ingram

350 Ellis St.

SF CA 94102

From: Jennifer Pereira
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Prop C funding for housing
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:59:25 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C such as Senior and Disability Action and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Jennifer C. Pereira (She/Her)
jennifer.pereira.ca@gmail.com
347.678.8676

From: Jolie Wu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 10:29:15 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jolie Wu
joliewu0710@gmail.com
1865 Fulton St Apt 4

San francisco, California 94117

From: Dan Raile
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 9:54:13 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I voted for Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018) because I agreed with the idea of a slight tax on the city's largest businesses to fund permanent housing, mental health services, and, to a lesser extent than these, an increase in temporary shelter beds. This seemed fair, so I voted for it. It seemed promising not least because it represented, to me, an approach that the city has not yet attempted despite decades of efforts to alleviate homelessness.

Seven years later, it doesn't seem the vote I and a majority of San Francisco voters cast has come to much. And we still haven't made a concerted effort to implement this measure that I and a majority of San Francisco voters enacted.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation, and to use the Prop C fund the way San Franciscans intended, which I understand to be the City's duty to carry out.

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This isn't just bad homelessness policy, it is a dangerous undermining of our democracy.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. It puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away

the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dan Raile
raile.daniel@gmail.com
220 Day St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Shayna Fertig
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:04:05 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Shayna Fertig
srfertig@gmail.com
3643 17th Street

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Norman Archer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 11:14:28 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Norman Archer
ntarcher@gmail.com
1351 Guerrero St

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Rick
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reject section 4
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:03:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Sent from my iPhone

From: Mahal Montes
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reject Section 4 to Preserve Proposition C
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:01:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Chen,

As a young organizer and housing equity researcher, I strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Warm regards,
Mahal Montes

From: Leslie Simon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:46:41 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Leslie Simon
simscha@sbcglobal.net
117 Brewster Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jack Calvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 6:17:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jack C
Resident, District 9

Jack Calvin
jackcalvin.sf2@gmail.com
101 Andover Street
San Francisco, California 94110-5607

From: Elizabeth MacMartin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:59:25 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth MacMartin
emacmar52@yahoo.com
4B Godeus Street

SanFrancisco, California 94110

From: Connie Chang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:34:23 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Connie

Connie Chang
cochang54@gmail.com

8 University St.
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94134

From: kyle chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:12:56 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

kyle chu
kylecaseychu@gmail.com
584 castro street

san francisco, California 94114

From: Lynda Berg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:08:31 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lynda Berg
lynda.berg15@gmail.com
1357 Natoma St

San Francisco , California 94103

From: Aditya Bhumbla
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:01:57 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Aditya Bhumbla
adit.bhumbla@gmail.com
525 Haight Street, Apt. B

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Andrew Scudder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:56:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Scudder
andrew@andrew-scudder.com
145 Hampshire St. Unit B

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Sasha Perigo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:24:39 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sasha Perigo
sasha.perigo@gmail.com
716 DOLORES ST

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Reina Loli-Tello
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:14:18 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Reina Tello D11 Resident

Reina Loli-Tello
reina.tello415@gmail.com

248 WINDING WAY
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Martha Hawthorne
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:04:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Martha Hawthorne
martha222@gmail.com
8, Putnam St

San Francisco, California 94110

From: awallace@teamsters2785.org
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:04:08 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Apollo Wallace

awallace@teamsters2785.org
1440 southgate ave
Daly City , California 94015

From: akeylah hernández
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:35:29 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

akeylah hernández
hernandezakeylah@gmail.com
1650 Rivera st

San Francisco , California 94116

From: Piper Alldredge
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:31:29 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to demand the Board and Mayor honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. I strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Piper Alldredge

Piper Alldredge
piper.alldredge@gmail.com
3947 Mission St
San Francisco, 94113

From: Laura Saunders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Voters Prop C Votes
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:29:15 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laura Saunders
tolsaunders@yahoo.com
170, King St

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Roisin Isner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:28:11 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Roisin Isner

Roisin Isner
roisinisner@gmail.com

1470 Thomas Ave
San Francisco, California 94124

From: Tess Gibbs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: REJECT SECTION 4 OF PROP C CHANGES
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:22:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident and worker. I work for Miss Major Alexander L. Lee TGIJP Black Trans Cultural Center, a nonprofit that the City of San Francisco relies on to provide housing subsidies using, in part, city funds. Our community of criminal "justice" system-impacted, homeless and insecurely housed, trans and queer, and Black and Brown people will suffer in the immediate future if your Board of Supervisors allows these changes to Prop C administration.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C, such as Miss Major Alexander L. Lee TGIJP Black Trans Cultural Center, and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

--
Tess Gibbs
She/her/hers
Community Donor Engagement Specialist
tess@tgijp.org
(415) 756-8176
Donate to our capital campaign here!

Miss Major Alexander L. Lee TGIJP Black Trans Cultural Center

131 Franklin St, San Francisco, CA 94102

Website | Instagram | Facebook | X (Twitter)



NOTICE: This email is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. It is intended solely for the person or entity it addresses. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, action taken, or not taken in reliance of the email is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this email in error, please reply to the sender immediately.

From: Sayuri Falconer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:10:57 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com
1190 Mission St Apt 601

San Francisco , California 94103

From: Ian James
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:01:19 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ian James
Ianhenryjames@gmail.com
1443 Lyon Street

San Francisco, California 94115

From: avashirin@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:41:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

avashirin@gmail.com
1458 45th st
San francisco, California 94122

From: Justin Dolezal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:20:59 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Justin Dolezal
justin.t.dolezal@gmail.com
826 Treat Ave

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jennifer Friedenbach
To: Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Solange Cuba; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Letter in opposition to removal of supermajority
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:35:20 AM
Attachments: New Prop C- Opposition to removing super majority.pdf

---

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

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

Please see our attached letter, thank you.

Jennifer Friedenbach (she,her)
jfriedenbach@cohsf.org
Coalition on Homelessness
280 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)346-3740
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___http://www.cohsf.org/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3MTNiMTUyZDUxYTFjODBkMTJlNDYzZTRhNWY4MzllYjo3OmE3ZGU6NmRkODcwMDdkMTI0NTg3NTNlZmVjNTg0Zjk3OWQwNjg4MjM3YmRlZmQ4MWNmM2MwNzI3MWFjYzcwMzMwOWI2OTp0OlQ6Tg
Twitter @TheCoalitionSF
Instagram coalitiononhomelessness
Facebook

Donate now to the Coalition on Homelessness!

"Love is an action, never just a feeling."

Bell Hooks

COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS

July 7th, 2025

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

As the architects of Proposition C, we strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018).

The initiative was crafted because the city's response to homelessness was falling short, was often influenced by both political expediency and a lack of will to truly address the crisis. We spend more than a year crafting the legislation meeting with everyone from unhoused community members, department heads, housing providers, front line service providers, small business owners and the Chamber of Commerce. We incorporated input and used the best data available to drive our funding allocations.

We very deliberately ensured that the more invisible elements of the unhoused received resources, ensuring 45% of housing went to previously ignored youth and family populations. Very little of the homeless resources were addressing child and youth homelessness. The idea was to go upstream as we were seeing homeless children and youth growing up to be chronically homeless adults and the devastating impacts of homelessness on their development and ability to thrive. We recognized, however, that things could change. We put in the allowance to have a supermajority of the Board be able to change the funding allocations. For the past two years, exactly that has happened.

Most recently, the Mayor proposed cutting $88.5 million from mostly youth and family housing and move it to mostly single adult shelter. While the Mayor cut $30m from family housing subsidies, $10m from youth subsidies and $1m from Bayview housing subsidies, the shelter plan was as of yet mostly

unprogrammed. The supermajority requirement facilitated a process where the programmed areas of the Mayors plan were preserved, while much of housing for youth and children will be restored. This is an important mechanism to preserve the people's will. The Board of Supervisors as the legislative branch is constructed to be the people's branch, and eliminating this provision, even in a limited manner is uncalled for. If there is good reason to change spending authority, good reason will prevail as it has time and again.

During the campaign, we had conversations with over 100,000 voters. Their primary concerns was accountability – that the funds would be used as intended. We described this provision, to most voter's satisfaction. This authority for the Board to change this provision is questionable. The legal text in the initiative has plain language that nowhere authorizes the Board to change this provision of a super majority requirement.

Section 4 has been separated and will come up for the vote at the full Board of Supervisors Tuesday July 8th. It reads as follows:

S*ection 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk by setting a very wrong and disturbing precedent. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Sincerely.

Jennifer Friedenbach
Executive Director

From: Sophie Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:32:32 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sophie Lewis
lewis.sophie87@gmail.com
9 Balmy Street

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Eric Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:03:45 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric Peterson
edp828@gmail.com
307 Bartlett St, Apt 6

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Sophie Rich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:02:25 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sophie Rich
sophie_rich@hotmail.com
1786 16th Ave

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Elijah Lizama
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:12:24 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Elijah Lizama

Elijah Lizama

elijahlizama7@gmail.com
5631A California Street
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Carson Reed
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:54:11 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter!!

Best,

Carson Reed
carson.m.reed@gmail.com
1290 GROVE ST

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Andrew Yousef
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 8:31:14 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Yousef
nines-slime-8g@icloud.com
2402 California St

San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Rae Bonfanti
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Reject Section 4, Listen to Voters
Date:	Sunday, July 6, 2025 7:59:44 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

===
Rae Bonfanti

From: Tomas Hemstad
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Respect the Will of Voters
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 7:34:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Tomas Hemstad

Tomas Hemstad
hemstad.tomas@gmail.com

150 Van Ness Ave #814
San Francisco, California 94102-5273

From:	lgpetty
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Segal, Ned (MYR)
Subject:	Hands Off Prop C Funds
Date:	Sunday, July 6, 2025 6:13:43 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Re: July 8 Board Agenda Item 32 #250609

I urge you not to authorize changes in voter-mandated Prop C (Our City Our Home) allocations and other provisions.

If you reallocate Prop C Ballot Initiative funds, you will be betraying the voters and defeating the carefully balanced effectiveness of this electoral mandate.

I don't see any difference between this attempt to divert funds from the mandates of the San Francisco electorate to serve a political agenda, and every attempt by the Trump administration to divert funds away from Congressional mandates in order to serve ideological politics.

To rewrite the voters' will to make future changes possible, and to take funds away from affordable permanent housing to spend on temporary shelters is arbitrary, dictatorial, and grossly incompetent. It is also unethical, and undemocratic; and certainly illegal.

Haven't we had enough of politics and personal political agendas ruining our chances to actually solve our problems? We succeed only when we rise above them.

San Francisco needs you to develop complementary additional funding sources; not undermine and defeat existing effectively working solutions prescribed by voters.

Hands off Prop C.

Lorraine Petty D2/D5

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	57 Letters regarding File No. 250609
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 1:57:00 PM
Attachments:	57 Letters regarding File No. 250609.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 57 letters regarding File No. 250609.

> **File No. 250609:** Ordinance authorizing the City to reallocate approximately $34,777,000 in prior appropriated revenue and unappropriated earned interest within the Our City, Our Home ("OCOH") Fund, to allow the City to use revenues from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax through Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 for certain types of services to address homelessness, notwithstanding the expenditure percentages set forth in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810; where future revenue and interest to the OCOH Fund exceeds amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, authorizing the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional revenues and interest on any programs to address homelessness as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810, without regard to the expenditure percentages in that section; temporarily suspending the limit on funding for short-term rental subsidies; and finding that these reallocations are necessary to achieve the purposes of the Our City, Our Home Fund pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2811. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Jodi S
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 1:07:10 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board

and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

San Francisco Voter and Community Advocate,

Jodi L. Schwartz

--
Jodi L. Schwartz
sfjodi@gmail.com

From:	Nora Roman
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t mess with Prop C
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:55:20 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor

the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter
Nora Roman, RN
home owner, parent, grandparent, retired RN from SFGH

From:	Eliza McGowen
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Stop The Removal Of Supermajority on Prop C!
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:51:35 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don’t break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

From: Jocelyn Saidenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:30:12 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jocelyn Saidenberg
jocelynsaidenberg@gmail.com
306 Rutledge Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: AzuCena Hernandez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: reject section four trailing legislation
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:13:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Azucena Hernandez

Coalition on Homelessness

280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

O: 415-346-3740

From: SHIBA BANDEEBA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Preserve Prop.C Funding
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 8:33:36 PM

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

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Shiba

--
Shiba Bandeeba, M.A, M.Ed
Pronouns: She/Her/Hers
Email: shibabandeeba@gmail.com
Phone: (818)-987-9121

From: TJ Kimball
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:20:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TJ Kimball
tjkimball92@gmail.com
31 Sheldon Terrace

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Jake Dayton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:18:56 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jake Dayton
jakedayton26@gmail.com
1880 Filbert St

San Francisco , California 94123

From: Louise Desmarchelier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:18:06 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Louise Desmarchelier
loul.desm@gmail.com
625 Powell Street

San Francisco, California 94108-3050

From: Fatemeh Hashemi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:18:03 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Fatemeh Hashemi
polo_copper.8s@icloud.com
2450 , Fulton St #202

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jenna Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:17:21 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Jenna

Jenna Lee
Lee.Jenna.n@gmail.com

643 Webster St, Apt 2
San Francisco, California 94117-2682

From: Osvaldo Salgado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:17:11 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Osvaldo Salgado
osvaldosalgado337@gmail.com
673 Brannan St

San Francisco , Oklahoma 74107

From: Stan Parkford
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:17:00 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stan Parkford
stanaparkford@gmail.com
620 Guerrero street Apt 5

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Nicholas Polimeni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:16:45 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Nicholas

Nicholas Polimeni
nicholas.polimeni@outlook.com

673 Brannan St
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Abigail Wainwright
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support Proposition C
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 6:21:33 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor Mahmood,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Abigail Wainwright
wainwrightabigail57@gmail.com
840 Haight Street

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Rebecca Jackson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Keep Your Power!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:15:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please please consider voting to keep your POWER as a board. It is crucial to keep a balance. Why would you give that up???

We are writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this

section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Rebecca Jackson (she/her/hers)
VP of Reentry & Public Affairs
Office: 415 223 1427

Support our work with a tax-deductible donation →

From: Charlie Fisch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Prop C
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:16:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Charlie Fisch

Coalition on Homelessness

280 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

O: 415-346-3740

From: Dorothy Quincy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:19:02 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Dorothy quincy

Dorothy Quincy
dorothyq1216@gmail.com

400 dolores street
San francisco, California 94110

From: Stefanie Mahthews
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:22:21 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stefanie Mahthews
mathews.stefanie@gmail.com
449 FLOOD AVE

San Francisco, California 94112

From:	Rick Girling
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS)
Subject:	Don"t override protections in Prop C
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:17:42 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent setting departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don’t break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Richard Girling
182 Banks St SF 94110

From: Laura Guzman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reject Section 4 from trailing legislation connected to Prop C, Our City Our Home
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:11:47 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, if future revenues and future earned interest deposited in the OCOH Fund exceed the amounts appropriated in the adopted budget for fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend up to $19,100,000 of such additional Mayor Lurie revenues or interest future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2027-28, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)(A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a precedent **setting departure from the provisions of Prop C.** Voters specifically required a **supermajority of the Board of Supervisors** to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote. This hurts voters today and this hurts voters tomorrow.

Hundreds of San Franciscans gathered on the steps of city hall on July 8th and thousands of letters have been sent. The message was simple: Reject the removal of the supermajority.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter. We know if the Mayor has a good proposal, he will get the votes.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation. Please don't break the promise Prop C made to voters.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

NHRC will be closed on Friday, July 4, 2025, in observance of Independence Day.

Please note, the National Harm Reduction Coalition participates in a modified summer schedule. Beginning May 23, 2025, through September 5, 2025, Friday office hours end at 1pm local time.

Do fewer things; work at a natural pace; obsess over quality. From Slow Productivity, The Lost Art of Accomplishment without Burnout.

HRC Logo

Laura Guzman, JD (she/her/ella)
Executive Director

510-830-5935
Based in: Oakland, CA
guzman@harmreduction.org
harmreduction.org

From: Isabella Hill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:20:37 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Isabella Hill
isabella.w.hill@gmail.com
836 HAIGHT ST

San Francisco, California 94117

From: María José Pastor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:15:04 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

María José Pastor
mariajpastor3@gmail.com
3649 26th Street

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Leonardo Serrano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:21:49 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Leonardo Serrano

Leonardo Serrano
leonardoserrano694@gmail.com

324 Larkin St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94102

From:	Simone Manganelli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	REJECT file 250609. Keep Prop C as VOTERS INTENDED
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:43:21 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

— Simone Manganelli
Resident, San Francisco

From: Catherine Terry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Respect Voter's Intentions
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:20:41 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

Prop C was approved by the people of San Francisco with a requirement for supermajority to change allocation of the funds. Respect the people of this city and uphold Prop C as it was intended— a safeguarded fund for the homeless.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you,
Catherine

Catherine Terry
c.terry1097@gmail.com
582 Grove Street

San Francisco, California 94102

From: Lauren Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Don"t touch Prop C
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:13:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Wren Murphy

From: Tan Cao
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:43:22 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tan Cao
tankhanhcao@gmail.com
171 Liberty Street

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Michael Armstrong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:39:20 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Michael

Michael Armstrong
michael@good-grows.org

360 SHOTWELL ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Peter van der Pas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:33:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Peter van der pas

Peter van der Pas
shoppingpder@gmail.com

696 Precita Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Leticia Javier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:33:14 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Leticia Javier
ljvier@gmail.com
1932 6th ave

Oakland, California 94606

From: Kathryn Hench
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: REJECT SECTION 4 FROM PROP C OUR CITY OUR HOME
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:54:54 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Kathryn Hench
408-455-7746
kathryn.hench@gmail.com

From: Yves Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reject section 4 associated with Prop C
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:20:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

From: Bryan Herrera
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Our City Our Home
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:04:52 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Engardio and the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

> *Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.*

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Best Wishes,

Bryan Herrera
he/him/his

From:	Arcelia Montoya
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Majority Requirement change at BOS
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:47:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Arcelia Montoya
Field Representative
Member Resource Center 877-687-1021

Find out what the Union is doing to protect members' rights during COVID19 and ensure public safety!
Info in English, Spanish and Chinese!

https://www.seiu1021.org/post/seiu-1021-covid-19-response-updates

Sign up to become a Union Member!Together We Rise Up!
http://bit.ly/SFMembershipForm

From: Lupe Velez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:36:52 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lupe Velez
lupe417@gmail.com
411 Bartlett

San Francisco , California 94110

From: Reba Crawford-Hayes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:46:15 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Reba Crawford-Hayes
rchayes1128@gmail.com
1330 39th Ave

San Francisco, California 94122

From: Stella Adelman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:13:34 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stella Adelman
stellarose30@hotmail.com
2427 Folsom St

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Megan Dabkowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:57:27 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Megan Dabkowski
megan.dabkowski@gmail.com
18 Gardenside Dr

San Francisco, California 94131

From: Jay B DeLange
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:14:20 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor mandelman

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jay B DeLange
braddelange@gmail.com
353 Douglass St

San Francisco , California 94114

From: Tess Gibbs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:47:13 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tess Gibbs
treegirltess@gmail.com
518 Clement St

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Patricia Plude
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:40:48 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

As a resident of District 7 and the Pastor of First Mennonite Church of San Francisco in District 8, I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform.

You can bet that the Faith Communities who worked very hard to help pass Prop C will be watching you and Mayor Lurie. We are counting on you to act with integrity and I promise you, we will mobilize the vote against those of you who do not.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Rev. Patricia Plude

Patricia Plude
pat@plude.com
70 Wawona St
San Francisco , California 94127

From: Santiago Melli-Huber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:20:41 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Santiago Melli-Huber
santiago.mellihuber@gmail.com
841 Diamond Street

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Alekhya Surepeddi
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Concerns regarding Proposition C
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:05:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am reaching out to request you reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with **Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018)**:

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This represents a significant deviation from the original intent of Prop C. Voters explicitly required a supermajority vote by the Board of Supervisors to make any changes to how Prop C funds are allocated. Section 4 of this legislation weakens that safeguard by allowing reallocations with only a simple majority.

Eliminating the supermajority requirement marks a clear break from past versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change disregards the will of the voters and undermines the integrity of the citizen initiative process—a process protected under the San Francisco Charter.

We urge you to uphold the intent of the voters and the integrity of Prop C by rejecting this section of the legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards,
Alekhya Surepeddi

From: Heather Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:58:01 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Heather

Heather Peterson
heather.a.peterson@gmail.com

850 oak st apt 11
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Tori Gibson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Afternoon Vote
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:57:10 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of San Francisco and I am writing to Strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

Please please please listen to our voices. I'm alive, clean over a year, volunteering and going back to school all because of these programs, and without it, people will die, and I feel you're already aware of this.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-With Appreciation,

Tori V. Gibson
510-621-7521
Torivgibson@gmail.com

From: eva.mancini@sanfranciscorising.org
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:55:06 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

eva.mancini@sanfranciscorising.org
1354 Florida St.
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Molly Salyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:51:33 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Molly Salyer
mollyblairsalyer@gmail.com
419 THORNTON AVE

San Francisco, California 94124

From: Jonah Bron
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:38:53 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jonah Bron
hi@jonah.id
358 Pierce St Apt 2

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Luc Bouchard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:24:38 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Luc Bouchard
Russian Hill Resident

Luc Bouchard

lbouchard010@gmail.com
1215 Greenwich St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: hallie cohen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:24:34 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

hallie cohen
hpcohen13@gmail.com
2855 24thst st

san francisco , California 94110

From: Kristine Waggener
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:24:29 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Kristine

Kristine Waggener
kristinewaggener@gmail.com
2374 42nd Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Traci Ramos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:20:13 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Traci Ramos
ramosity@gmail.com
1320 6th ave

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Traci Ramos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:20:06 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Traci Ramos
ramosity@gmail.com
1320 6th ave

San Francisco , California 94122

From: Lynne Angel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the Mayor"s Power Grab
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:17:07 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor(s):

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

"Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation."

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and creates a precedent that puts the integrity of all citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

As Supervisors, your role is to provide a check and balance to Mayoral power – to give away the ability to do so is a dereliction of the duties you were elected to perform. We call on you to uphold the democratic process, and to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Lynne Angel

Lynne Angel
lynne@elriosf.com

1121 Alabama St
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Alison Goh
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	LWVSF Advocacy
Subject:	Reject Section 4, Save Prop C funds
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:16:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A}-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

League of Women Voters of San Francisco

_____
Alison Goh
President
president@lwvsf.org
pronouns: she/her

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104
415-989-8683 ▪ Facebook ▪ Twitter
Empowering voters. Defending democracy. Learn more at lwvsf.org.

Item 28

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: GGP meter proposal
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:23:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Susan Wilpitz regarding File No. 250617, which is Item No. 27 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250617:** Resolution authorizing the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park in accordance with Park Code provisions that authorize SFMTA rate-setting on park property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: fogtownsf1 <fogtownsf1@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:10 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Nancy Pelosi Pelosi <info@pelosiforcongress.org>
Subject: GGP meter proposal

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

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie,

Personally I've appreciated your vision, progress here in our beautiful city.

Please reject the proposal for new meters in Golden Gate Park as this will be an unfair financial burden on our citizens, seniors!
We've seen our electric, water and recology rates continue to increase.

Having to pay for parking around the Lisa and Douglas Goldman Tennis Center

will have our choices move to the other free public courses around the city.

If this proposal passes you will deter other bay area residents who incur increased bridge tolls, the entrance fees visiting our wonderful museums in GGP
Vehicles will inundate the neighborhoods surrounding GGP for free parking spaces

- **Kind regards**
- **susan wilpitz**
- **Native San Franciscan**

Item 29

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Strongly SUPPORTING Rules Committee Meeting July 7, 2025 Agenda Item #5 [Administrative Code - Section 501(c)(4) Organization Prohibitions] File #241211
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:51:00 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding File No. 241211.

File No. 241211 - Administrative Code - Section 501(c)(4) Organization Prohibitions.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
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

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 6, 2025 1:20 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strongly SUPPORTING Rules Committee Meeting July 7, 2025 Agenda Item #5 [Administrative Code - Section 501(c)(4) Organization Prohibitions] File #241211

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

TO: Rules Committee members and full Board of Supervisors

FROM: Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: Rules Committee Meeting July 7, 2025 Agenda Item #5 [Administrative Code - Section 501(c)(4) Organization Prohibitions] File #241211

Position: Strongly SUPPORTING

In the interest of good governance and best practices, I'm strongly supporting this legislation to close a potential loophole.

This potential loophole could mean that a 501(c)(3) organization could receive City funding and then potentially transfer all or part of that funding to a related 501(c)(4) for advocacy.

This could mean that City funds could potentially circle back and be used to advocate with the City for specific issues.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Item 30

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	179 Letters regarding File No. 250655
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:04:00 AM
Attachments:	179 Letters regarding File No. 250655.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 179 letters regarding File No. 250655, which is Item, No. 13 on today's Budget and Finance Committee Agenda.

> **File No. 250655:** Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor, Melgar, Mandelman, Engardio, Dorsey, Sherrill)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Jeantelle Laberinto
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); SherrillStaff; Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	REP-SF Letter: File #250655
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:00:55 PM
Attachments:	REP-SF Letter #250655 RV Legislation.docx.pdf

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

Dear Budget & Finance Committee Chair Chan and the Board of Supervisors,

Please find the attached letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) detailing deep concerns re: Legislative File #250655, "Large and Commercial Vehicle Parking Restrictions - Hours and Exceptions," which is on the Budget & Finance Committee agenda tomorrow, July 9th at 10am.

Respectfully,
Jeantelle Laberinto
on behalf of REP-SF

--
Jeantelle Laberinto (she/her)
Policy & Community Organizer
People Power Media
Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition

July 8, 2025

Chair of the Budget & Finance Committee, Supervisor Chan
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: File #250655 RV Legislation – OPPOSE

Dear Supervisors,

As the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF), we are writing with deep concern and opposition to the legislation banning RVs from San Francisco by imposing citywide two-hour parking restrictions on large vehicles. This legislation will harm many immigrant community members who live in RVs and will negatively impact the homelessness response system, potentially increasing street homelessness.

REP-SF envisions a San Francisco that empowers historically marginalized communities in housing justice and equity in land use. This legislation is in direct opposition to this vision. People of color, immigrants, extremely low-income residents, seniors, and people with disabilities make up most, if not all, of the people living in RVs. During this time of increased enforcement and anti-immigrant sentiment, immigrants are especially vulnerable. Given current challenges and fears, it is unrealistic to expect immigrant households to trust City workers or feel comfortable interacting with government assistance – but if households are not available to talk to City workers, they will be vulnerable to towing. If households are able to get a permit and access to resources, the available options are largely inappropriate for their needs. The housing resources set aside in this plan are time-limited subsidies, which are often very difficult for extremely low-income, immigrant and undocumented households to succeed in given that they are expected to double or triple their income by the end of the subsidy – otherwise they return to homelessness. There are also alternatives we should be advancing, including setting up safe parking sites for RV residents and those living in vehicles, and finding new revenue sources to add housing options for RV residents.

As advocates for equitable housing access, we are disturbed by the ripple effects this legislation will have on the affordable housing and homelessness response systems. For those living in RVs who are able to receive a permit, most will only have up to 12 months to get an offer of housing or non-congregate shelter. We know that it can often take much longer than a year to successfully be housed or even get non-congregate shelter. This leaves many households

vulnerable to towing and subsequent street homelessness. Further, there are not enough housing subsidies or shelter spots for everyone who needs and wants these resources. The City must be honest about this shortage of resources and pragmatic about the allocation of limited housing and shelter options. If RV households are prioritized over all other households because of the pressures of the looming RV ban, resources will be diverted away from families and adults on the streets and in shelters. Hundreds of families and single adults are on the shelter waitlists, and even more are on the street.

All people deserve housing, but this approach to housing people is not informed by justice and equity. We need to expand the deeply affordable housing available to our communities so that we are not pitting different groups of people experiencing homelessness against each other. We must listen to the communities most impacted by housing insecurity and homelessness and provide housing, not punishment and increased instability.

We need real solutions to address the affordability crisis in our city. This legislation does not help us in this effort. We are urging you to oppose the legislation.

Sincerely,

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco (REP-SF)

From: Marie O"Connor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:15:51 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Marie
California

From: Larissa Fawn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:11:15 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Larissa
California

From: AJ cho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:07:33 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

AJ
California

From: Clem Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:04:17 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Clem
California

From: Patrick Ramos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:00:40 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Patrick
California

From: Ryan Maher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:57:44 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering inadequate services in return, as a best-case scenario.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is reliable, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently invoke the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, punishing

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and the oligarchs he represents to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Ryan
California

From: Ryan Maher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:57:41 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering inadequate services in return, as a best-case scenario.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is reliable, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently invoke the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, punishing

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and the oligarchs he represents to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Ryan
California

From: Dan Poole
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:43:58 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Dan
California

From: Alejandra Rubio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:37:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Alejandra
California

From: Edward Kuhn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:34:05 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Edward
California

From: Shiba Bandeeba
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:31:34 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Shiba
California

From: Julien Stainback
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:30:21 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

You can not add on more and more penalties against the people just trying to survive in this place without having an option to shelter them. Period.

SFMTA makes enough money siphoning from people just trying to live and work in the city. Folks without a place to sleep need these RVs. Can you at least give a 48 hour limit or something that lets people move but still get enough time to rest?

What is your goal here? Where do the people go after you tow their homes away? Unless you answer that in your proposed legislation then youre just exacerbating the problem more and kicking the can down the line to SEEM like you are doing something. You're human too

Julien
California

From: Alex Rodriguez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:28:01 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Alex
California

From: John Stiefel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote No on the RV Ban - It Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:23:33 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking.

I have spent the past 20+ years working alongside vulnerable groups around the world, including the past 8+ years getting to know many unhoused San Franciscans, many of whom rely on their vehicle as their primary asset and only form or shelter. As such, I believe that this ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this important issue!

Cheers,

John M. Stiefel
(Resident of the Mission District, San Francisco)

John
California

From: Jonathan Nguyen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:18:18 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jonathan
California

From: Pascual Martinez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:18:12 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Pascual
California

From: ryann haskins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:14:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

ryann
California

From: Joshua Siebalt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:05:21 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Joshua
California

From: camila Killion
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:00:50 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

camila
California

From: Marco Colmenares Jr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:24:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Marco
California

From: beyonca perez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:20:01 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

beyonca
California

From: Iycia Yousfi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:19:35 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

lycia
California

From: Asha Noorullah
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:16:42 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Asha
California

From: Delilah Aviles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:14:09 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Delilah
California

From: Kenneth Quintanar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:11:21 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kenneth
California

From: Kate Heetland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:06:11 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kate
California

From: Mary Snyder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:05:23 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Mary
California

From: Amaya Munoz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:04:10 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Amaya
California

From: Chloe Vuillermoz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:02:35 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Chloe
California

From: Nathalie Paven
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:00:18 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Nathalie
California

From: Rachel Martin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:59:23 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Rachel
California

From: Kayla Windham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:58:14 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kayla
California

From: Nico Vera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:51:31 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Nico
California

From: Olivia McHaney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:49:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

We must completely reject reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban is a massive attack on working class people from all walks of life here in San Francisco. It will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Olivia
California

From: hannah chung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:49:39 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

hannah
California

From: Frisco Gomez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:43:22 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Frisco
California

From: Dalissa Sandigo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:42:51 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Dalissa
California

From: sarai m
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:41:15 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

sarai

From: Carol Bettencourt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:40:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Carol
California

From: Dakota Leal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:39:00 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Dakota
California

From: Judith Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:38:39 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Judith
California

From: Fabi Gamino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:38:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Fabi
California

From: Ivan Mendieta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:35:54 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Ivan
California

From: Christabel Ramirez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:32:35 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Christabel
California

From: Angie Arroyo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:31:30 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Angie
California

From: Emily Rudisill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:23:25 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Emily
California

From: Alicia Lopez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:20:57 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Stop criminalizing being poor in San Francisco. It is San Francisco government policy that allows for this wealth disparity. When some people are making 100s of dollars an hour and some of us are making minimum wage and to get into a home affordable housing is quite literally like winning the LOTTERY. My family used to live in an RV right across the street from our house which we owned. We lived in a 1 bedroom with my mother, stepfather, 3 siblings, and my grandmother. Our RV gave us room to breathe. It is not just homeless people that use RVs. If rich people can own fancy RVs and take them on vacations why can't we own ours? Regardless of how a person uses their RV- banning RVs is not going to disappear homelessness in San Francisco. We need investment into workforce development and food subsidies. There is a reason why businesses are thriving in San Francisco and it's because San Franciscans can't afford San Francisco anymore.

Alicia
California

From: Karen Kirschling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:20:45 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Karen
California

From: Cheryl Sinclair
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 1:18:03 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Cheryl
California

From: Jessie Fernandez
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:46:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Jessie Fernandez with PODER .Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. Without appropriate offers to housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes, because this effort will increase street homelessness. This approach targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

If people's RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. The City does not have enough housing and shelter beds to offer the over 1,400 people living in their vehicles in San Francisco. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. There are 295 families (872 people) on the family shelter waitlist and over 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. The City counted 437 occupied large vehicles in May 2025, yet only 65 new rapid rehousing subsidies are being made available as part of this plan and only 115 are being set aside overall. These housing options are also coming at the expense of people in shelter and on the street who have desperately been waiting for housing resources. People will spend longer stuck in shelter or on the street because the few available resources will be diverted to households in RVs. There is not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

This plan limits who gets refuge permits to the RV residents who were found during a two week period when the city attempted to count every single vehicle across the city. Any vehicle that they missed, at no fault of the residents, would be subject to enforcement and could end up on the street. The permits would expire after at most 12 months regardless of whether an appropriate offer of services has been offered. Then households would be targeted for tows even though they had never been offered services. It takes a long time to find housing or even non-congregate shelter. With the City potentially trying to help hundreds of households, this will easily take over a year, and those who are not helped could end up homeless on the street.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; enacting a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. In a time when the City is facing a huge fiscal deficit, this ban will waste already limited SFMTA and SFPD resources, while only creating more chaos on the streets.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Thank you,

--
Jessie Fernandez (el/he/him)
¡PODER!

From: Jessie Fernandez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:16:32 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jessie

From: Vinodkumar Gadley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:10:26 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Vinodkumar
Nevada

From: Darris Thomas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:00:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

To Supervisors Connie Chan and Joel Engardio, I am a graduate student at the University of San Francisco (which is located within your districts. The St. Anne's Law School dormitory is located in Supervisor Engardio's district) and it would be very disappointing if you voted YES on this RV ban. In a 2019 UCLA study, 5% of students surveyed across the University of California system reported living in a vehicle during college. Anecdotal evidence and campus media suggest that RV living is more common at colleges in high-cost urban areas like the University of California, Santa Cruz (UC Santa Cruz), Stanford University, San Francisco State University, and Santa Monica College to name a few. High housing costs drive students to seek alternative living arrangements. For instance, the median rent for a studio apartment in the Bay Area is $2,000 per month, while RV parks (if accessible) range between $500 to

$1,200 per month.

Darris
California

From: Marci Spencer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:58:59 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Marci
California

From: Mimi Abers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:56:19 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Mimi
California

From: L. Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:41:57 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

L.
California

From: Calder Lorenz
To: Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Large and Commercial Vehicle Parking Restrictions: Oppose Item #13
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:38:57 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Calder Lorenz, I am the Director of Operations for The Gubbio Project and a San Francisco resident. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. Without appropriate offers to housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes, because this effort will increase street homelessness. This approach targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

The Gubbio Project's mission is to be in community with and to provide a sacred space and sanctuary for unhoused people in need of safe, compassionate respite during the day. Our program is housed at St. John's in the Mission and currently provides critical services to 100 individuals daily through a highly unique and successful model that combines social justice, peer support, and harm reduction. The Gubbio Project calls for a more just, compassionate and non-punitive approach by public agencies and policymakers.

We currently serve both guests and staff that have no other option but to live in their RVs, until more equitable access to housing is available here in the City, their biggest safety net is their vehicles and they cannot pay fines and fees or risk losing their employment due to tickets or being towed or losing access to vital community and services.

If people's RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. The City does not have enough housing and shelter beds to offer the **over 1,400 people living in their vehicles** in San Francisco. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that **90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles**. There are 295 families (872 people) on the family shelter waitlist and over 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. The City counted **437 occupied large vehicles** in May 2025, yet **only 65 new rapid rehousing subsidies are being made available as part of this plan and only 115 are being set aside overall**. These housing options are also coming at the expense of people in shelter and on the street who have desperately been waiting for housing resources. People will spend longer stuck in shelter or on the street because the few available resources will be diverted to households in RVs. There is not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

This plan limits who gets refuge permits to the RV residents who were found during a two week period when the city attempted to count every single vehicle across the city. Any vehicle that they

missed, at no fault of the residents, would be subject to enforcement and could end up on the street. The permits would expire after 6, or at most 12, months regardless of whether an appropriate offer of services has been offered. Then households would be targeted for tows even though they had never been offered services. It takes a long time to find housing or even non-congregate shelter. With the City potentially trying to help hundreds of households, this will easily take over a year, and those who are not helped could end up homeless on the street.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; enacting a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. In a time when the City is facing a huge fiscal deficit, this ban will **waste already limited SFMTA and SFPD resources**, while only creating more chaos on the streets.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

In Community,

Calder

--

From: Gina Bates
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:35:44 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please REJECT the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking.

This ban will
increase street homelessness.

PEOPLE CANNOT AFFORD HOUSING SO THIS IS ALL THEY HAVE & THEY HAVE TO SLEEP!

Leave them& theur RVs alone. They're not bothering anyone

This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Gina
Ohio

From: Elise Joshi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:31:27 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Elise
California

From: Elise Joshi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:31:25 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Elise
California

From: Dante Popalisky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:41:15 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Dante
California

From: Jennifer Raeder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:34:27 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Jennifer
California

From: Jesse Rosemoore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:25:48 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Jesse
California

From: Linda Barber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 10:27:03 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Linda Barber

Linda
California

From: Jason Swan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Stop the RV ban
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 3:30:31 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing in opposition to the proposed RV ban. In an era where we're seeing an increased housing shortage, staggering rent increases, and wages that aren't keeping pace, telling people that they can't stay here is unconciable. It's passing the issues on to some other city instead of dealing with the issues and allowing these people to continue to call our city home.

These people are enough fortunate to have a roof over their heads, but this proposal will tell them that they aren't welcome anyways just because they don't have a fixed address. Instead, we should find a way to accommodate them while solving of parking and residency by building a dedicated area for RV parking. Unhoused folks know how it feels to be unwanted every day, and I would have hoped a mayor that used to run a non profit to combat homelessness would understand that. Let's get these people some space and allow them the dignity they're so often denied.

Sincerely,
Jason Swan
Mission Dolores resident

Jason
California

From: Max Posse
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 11:09:56 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Max
California

From: Harry Pariser
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 10:39:16 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Supervisor:
I share all the sentiments here.
Anyone who supports this ban supports racism!

Harry S. Pariser

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Harry
California

From: Thea Boodhoo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:06:17 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Thea
California

From: jo.a.smith@icloud.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 9:03:15 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From: Megan Luby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 6:34:07 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Megan
California

From: Geoff Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:41:11 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Geoff
California

From: Marth Goldin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 7:43:56 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Don't want people in RV's parked on the streets? Provide safe parking places and services. Do not pretend that shuffling RV's from one parking place to another is providing people with a safe place to live. Do not pretend that offering a few inadequate temporary homes to RV dwellers is a solution. Provide safe parking and services for RV dwellers until real housing is available.

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting their tenants isn't how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn't have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn't poverty tows. I'm asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Marth
California

From: Laura Goldin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 6:56:11 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a District 1 San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering wholly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting their tenants isn't

how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn't have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn't poverty tows. I'm asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

We refer to our unhoused neighbors as "homeless." RVs are homes for those without other options. This legislations contributes to the problem and solves nothing. The solution to homelessness is HOMES.

Sincerely,

Laura
California

From: AA AA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:52:54 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

AA

AA
California

From: Jennifer Lynch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 5:04:15 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident (94110)writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and >>contrary to established research<>by providing permanent, affordable housing<<.

No one is saying SF shouldn't have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn't poverty tows. I'm asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Jennifer
California

From: Claire Baker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:27:57 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking.

If mayor Lurie wants to continue depriving poor people of the last spaced they can try to live, he should pay for their housing himself.

The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping

people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting their tenants isn't how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn't have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn't poverty tows. I'm asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Claire
California

From: Helen Ung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:18:28 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Helen
California

From: Anastasia Yovanopoulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:59:21 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I am President of SF Tenants Union Board asking you to please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.
Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
SF, CA 94114 D#8

Anastasia
California

From: Maria Ellman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:44:47 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Maria
California

From: Rachel Ellenberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 10:14:27 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Rachel Ellenberger

Rachel
California

From:	Tess Gibbs
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Street Homelessness
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 3:47:23 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Tess Gibbs and I live and work in San Francisco.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. Without appropriate offers to housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes, because this effort will increase street homelessness. This approach targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

This proposal would waste resources while the SFMTA is suffering financially. At a time when we are trying to avoid cuts to services, the MTA shouldn't be spending money and staff time on such harmful, counterproductive enforcement. This proposal includes $3 million for signage and enforcement by the Municipal Transportation Agency alone!

If people's RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. The City does not have enough housing and shelter beds to offer the **over 1,400 people living in their vehicles** in San Francisco. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that **90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles**. There are 295 families (872 people) on the family shelter waitlist and over 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. The City counted **437 occupied large vehicles** in May 2025, yet **only 65 new rapid rehousing subsidies are being made available as part of this plan and only 115 are being set aside overall**. These housing options are also coming at the expense of people in shelter and on the street who have desperately been waiting for housing resources. People will spend longer stuck in shelter or on the street because the few available resources will be diverted to households in RVs. There is not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

This plan limits who gets refuge permits to the RV residents who were found during a two week period when the city attempted to count every single vehicle across the city. Any vehicle that they missed, at no fault of the residents, would be subject to enforcement and could end up on the street. The permits would expire after at most 12 months regardless of whether an appropriate offer of services has been offered. Then households would be targeted for tows even though they had never been offered services. It takes a long time to find housing or even non-congregate shelter. With the City potentially trying to help hundreds of households, this will easily take over a year, and those who are not helped could end up homeless on the street.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; enacting a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. In a time when the City is facing a huge fiscal deficit, this ban will **waste already limited SFMTA and SFPD resources**, while only creating more chaos on the streets.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Thank you,

--
Tess Gibbs

From: Marie Sorenson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:28:11 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Marie
California

From: BC Richardson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Mayor's RV Ban and Parking Sites
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 10:22:00 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident in District 5, writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking.

RVs are homes for my neighbors. They are a last resort, especially given how overrun the shelters are here. There are 800+ people on the family shelter waitlist how would adding the thousand some living RVs work out? Where are these people living and working from their RV's going to go?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Safe parking sites allow some middle-ground, addressing complaints about street conditions but without stripping housing from our neighbors and community member. Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City all run safe parking sites affordably--it is absolutely possible in SF.

To me it seems Mayor's plan prioritizes reducing visible poverty over addressing the underlying causes of these problems. The 2-hour parking ban is sweeping people under the rug in a way that will ruin people's lives. The real issue here is a lack of permanent, affordable housing in the city, displacing a thousand more people is not going to help with that.

Please push Mayor Lurie to address the real issue here, one that includes safe parking sites and a longer term plan for affordable housing in the city.

Sincerely,
BC Richardson

BC
California

From: Eva Kitlen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:24:35 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident and UCSF medical student writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

As a student and healthcare worker at San Francisco General Hospital, I work day in and day out with San Franciscans who are forced to rely on their RVs for shelter - many strive to move to permanent housing, but in the meantime, their RVs are quite literally lifesaving by creating a safe place to sleep and a place to safely store critical medications.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the

Mayor’s plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor’s plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of ‘vanlords’ to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Eva Kitlen
UCSF Medical Student

Eva
California

From: Josh Zeier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:11:34 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Josh
California

From: Gabriel Medina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:33:26 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Gabriel
California

From: Chris Lamkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:11:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Chris
California

From: George Kadifa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 6:07:50 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

George
California

From: Celestina Pearl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:18:46 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Celestina
California

From: Harvey Milk Club Communications
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 4:48:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking introduced by Mayor Lurie. Without appropriate offers to housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes.

This approach targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

If people's RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. The City does not have enough housing and shelter beds to offer the **over 1,400 people living in their vehicles** in San Francisco. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that **90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles**. There are 295 families (872 people) on the family shelter waitlist and over 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. The City counted **437 occupied large vehicles** in May 2025, yet **only 65 new rapid rehousing subsidies are being made available as part of this plan and only 115 are being set aside overall**. These housing options are also coming at the expense of people in shelter and on the street who have desperately been waiting for housing resources. People will spend longer stuck in shelter or on the street because the few available resources will be diverted to households in RVs. There is not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

This plan limits who gets refuge permits to the RV residents who were found during a two week period when the city attempted to count every single vehicle across the city. Any vehicle that they missed, at no fault of the residents, would be subject to enforcement and could end up on the street. The permits would expire after at most 12 months regardless of whether an appropriate offer of services has been offered. Then households would be targeted for tows even though they had never been offered services. It takes a long time to find housing or even non-congregate shelter. With the City potentially trying to help hundreds of households, this will easily take over a year, and those who are not helped could end up homeless on the street.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; enacting a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. In a time when the City is facing a huge fiscal deficit, this ban will **waste already limited SFMTA and SFPD resources**, while only creating more chaos on the streets.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. We believe towing and displacement helps no one.

Thank you,

The Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club

From: Jes Distad
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 4:43:10 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jes
California

From: Jacqueline Keegan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:27:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline
California

From: Ciara Keegan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:22:49 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Ciara
California

From: Sarah Renjilian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:29:37 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello! I'm a teacher and Mission resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Sadie

Sarah
California

From: Katelyn Dever
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:14:02 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

It's time the people in positions of power actually have some real empathy for those not born into wealth, those struggling with mental and physical health issues, those seeking asylum from violence, those who actually need real help. It's time the people who claim to be representatives of the people actually LISTEN TO THEM, and to BE THEIR VOICE. Shame on Daniel Lurie, a BILLIONAIRE HEIR, for trying to snatch away what little our most vulnerable communities have left. And shame on all who are contributing or complicit to this cruelty, simply to climb the political or financial ladder, for whatever selfish reasons you're somehow justifying. Where do you want the lower class to go? Do you just want them all to die so you don't have to experience the nuisance of their existence? I know that's not true since they do all the jobs you rich folk feel you're too superior for. They grow, cook, and serve your food,

they drive you around, they care for YOUR CHILDREN, they basically take care of everything for you. When will you compensate the ESSENTIAL WORKERS fairly for their labor? Where does it end? When will it be enough? When will you all be satisfied and stop taking taking taking?

Katelyn
California

From: Russel Deleon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:08:30 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

This ban won't help the issue, or the people. Why continue to criminalize people trying to live instead of going after the ones causing people to live out of their vehicles? Actually do something important and write legislation to stop corps from buying property. Stop building luxury condos, stop allowing rent prices to be inflated by the greed of the already wealthy. Do something useful for once instead of attacking the people that work in the city and give it the life it has.

Russel
California

From: Calvin Fiske
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:50:19 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Calvin
California

From: Paul Ramstad
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:44:34 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Paul
California

From: Sarita Groisser
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: RV
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:40:27 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,
I am a constituent of District 8 and a long time SF resident.
I am writing to protest upcoming RV bans proposals.
We already have too many families living on the streets!
It seems unnecessarily cruel to remove folks who are barely scraping by from their protection of an RV as a shelter.
Please do the right thing.
Vote AGAINST further restrictions of RV parking.
Thank you.
Sarita Groisser
60 Crestline Drive #11
SF 94131
415-570-3507

From: Betana Lara-Vazquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:32:16 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Betana
California

From: gloria boyd
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:10:45 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

gloria
California

From: amelie.letoile.goga@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:52:08 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From: Cathleen Escolta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:44:12 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Cathleen
California

From: Ishaan Sangwan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:23:36 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I am a physician in the community who cares deeply about the homelessness crisis in the city and the RV ban would worsen this significantly. The people in RVs are not going to simply pack up and leave the area: they're going to be driven to street homelessness, which is a threat to their safety as well as the safety and cleanliness of the city at large. This is a shameful proposal from a candidate that purports to make homelessness his key issue. Put some actual funding into homeless shelters instead of trying to enforce this please and make the city a safer space.

Ishaan
Oregon

From: Andrea Yeager
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 8:02:21 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident and city employee writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Andrea Yeager
Youth Services Librarian

Andrea
California

From: Maribel herrera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:39:39 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Maribel
California

From: Krishan Patel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:53:13 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Krishan
California

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:00:52 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Nick
California

From: Stanley Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:10:47 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Stanley
California

From: Cameron Rappaport
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:38:45 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Cameron
California

From: Miranda Brawner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:22:07 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Miranda
Georgia

From: Jonah Craig
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:17:17 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jonah
California

From: Kayla Nachtsheim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:59:06 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kayla
California

From: Matthew Boguske
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:55:34 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities, and seniors when they are seeking them. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist, and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelters without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in a shelter. Housing heals, towing, and displacement help no one.

Matthew
New York

From:	Matthew Boguske
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Street Homelessness
Date:	Monday, July 7, 2025 10:46:33 PM

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

My name is Matthew Boguske in Lowville, NY. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. Without appropriate offers of housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes, because this effort will increase street homelessness. This approach targets working-class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

If people's RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. The City does not have enough housing and shelter beds to offer to the **over 1,400 people living in their vehicles** in San Francisco. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that **90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their cars**. There are 295 families (872 people) on the family shelter waitlist, and over 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. The City counted **437 occupied large vehicles** in May 2025; however, **only 65 new rapid rehousing subsidies are being made available as part of this plan, and only 115 are being set aside overall**. These housing options are also coming at the expense of people in shelters and on the street who have desperately been waiting for housing resources. People will spend longer stuck in shelters or on the street because the few available resources will be diverted to households in RVs. There is not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

This plan limits who gets refuge permits to the RV residents who were found during two weeks when the city attempted to count every single vehicle across the city. Any vehicle that they missed, at no fault of the residents, would be subject to enforcement and could end up on the street. The permits would expire after at most 12 months, regardless of whether an appropriate offer of services has been made. Then, households would be targeted for tows even though they had never been offered services. It takes a long time to find housing or even a non-congregate shelter. With the City potentially trying to help hundreds of households, this will easily take over a year, and those who are not helped could end up homeless on the street.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; enacting a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. In a time when the City is facing a huge fiscal deficit, this ban will **waste already limited SFMTA and SFPD resources**, while only creating more chaos on the streets.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement help no one.

Thank you,

Matthew Boguske

From: Alison Alstrom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:38:29 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Alison
California

From: Layne Fajeau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:32:22 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Layne
California

From: Natalie Aleman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:24:00 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Natalie
California

From: Naila Grande Meza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:19:16 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Naila
California

From: amelie bellemans
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:11:22 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

amelie
California

From: Bri Rodriguez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Hello! Please vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:07:43 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Bri
California

From: Olivia Fadda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:44:56 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Olivia
California

From: emmanuel blackwell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:20:10 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

emmanuel
California

From: Richard Carini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:12:25 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Richard
California

From: Maria Isabel Brena
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:11:12 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Maria Isabel
California

From: Jordan Lanham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 8:07:20 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

These are my neighbors that I value and have relationships with. As a resident, I have no issue with folks parking their homes as this is a basic need all humans deserve. I will have to reconsider my vote in the future is this is not combated by you, however, I urge you to be ethical and empathic in your decision by voting NO to this RV ban.

Thank you,
Jordan Lanham

Jordan
California

From: Karson Kutz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:39:51 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Karson
California

From: Agent DMZ.
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:57:35 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Agent
New York

From: zoe eisenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:23:38 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

zoe
California

From: Ashley Omwanghe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:45:00 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Ashley
California

From: Alyssa Nguyen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:17:17 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I work near an area that was once filled with RVs parked on the street. They have never caused trouble, and I feared that they no longer had a safe place to stay after seeing them sweeped from the streets. This is already a vulnerable population, and to push them out is to put them in more dangerous situations.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Alyssa
California

From: Mikayla Fender
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:13:43 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Mikayla
California

From: Saunders Smithwick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:55:01 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Saunders
California

From: Chloe Pressman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:51:13 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Chloe
California

From: Natasha Si
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:49:39 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Natasha
California

From: Marie O"Connor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:28:34 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Dear Supervisor Joel Engardio,
I live in District 4 and have been a San Francisco resident since 1975. I didn't see anyone living on the street or in their vehicles until the late 80's, and the first unhoused folks I noticed were among those who had been released from the state mental hospitals without the levels of community mental health resources funded adequately to support them…Anyone knows that was only the beginning of safety net shredding and obscene escalation of property values. Both of these systemic factors have humane solutions (requiring political will rooted in the common good). 2 hour parking restrictions for RVs is NOT a humane solution. We really don't deserve our City's name for many years now.
Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one. Please oppose the inhumane limits on RV parking, and keep FRANCIS in San FRANCISco.

Marie
California

From: Lydia Garvey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:26:27 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Lydia
Oklahoma

From: Justice Dumlao
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:33:07 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I know you are getting a lot of these emails but please please reconsider this RV Ban. We need to do more to create social safety nets and not turn the existing services we do have into an even more impacted program that will only serve to increase our waitlists and create turmoil within the unhoused community. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Justice
California

From: David Mauroff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:03:55 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I am writing on behalf of San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project. We serve 70% of the people who are presumed innocent while being released from jail. In our efforts to protect public safety and ensure our clients attend court, a lack of housing is one of our most significant challenges. Especially after being incarcerated, people need shelter to stabilize their lives. There has to be a better solution than banning and towing vehicles. We can do better and trust our City leaders can find an answer outside of this punitive legislation.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

David
California

From: kenjo wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:01:11 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

kenjo
California

From: Claire Eccles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:40:59 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Claire
California

From: J Logan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:30:45 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

J
California

From: Kevin Nguyen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 1:29:15 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kevin
California

From: Rielle Hamilton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:49:42 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Rielle
California

From: Eva Mancini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:22:52 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Eva
California

From: Violet Vasquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:13:47 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Violet
California

From: Hunter Kippen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:40:38 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Hunter

Hunter
California

From: Hunter Kippen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:40:37 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Hunter

Hunter
California

From: Natalie Fong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:00:20 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.
The RVs do not bother the residents of San Francisco, the people who have lived here for generations, because we know what it looks like to have our families fight for survival and want or need to be in the city. Let San Francisco be a safe place for families, communities of color, immigrants, not just the tech workers and rich folks.
When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Natalie
California

From: Ricky Salvador
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:35:31 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Ricky
California

From: miya stephanoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 6:51:18 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Miya S

miya
California

From: Sienna Beach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote NO on the RV Ban !!!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:12:22 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Hello,

Please reject the two hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Sienna
California

From: Landon Nguyen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:03:31 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Landon
California

From: Simone Manganelli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:01:55 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I can't believe that we're still e-mailing you pols about this kind of stuff. STOP IMPOSING BANS AND NEW RESTRICTIONS ON PEOPLE THAT CAN'T AFFORD A HOME. Until you just *give* them a home (one that is private not shared, one that is actually affordable to them, one that does NOT have curfews, one that does NOT have any restrictions on who it's given to), then just leave them the hell alone. This silly RV ban is another example of San Francisco politicians taking cues from ultra-fascist Republicans and making it their own.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Simone

From: harlo.p.pippenger@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:11:19 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From:	Mags Christie
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Street Homelessness
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:02:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Mags and I live in the Mission District of San Francisco.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. Without appropriate offers to housing readily available, this will harm people across the city, especially those who use their RVs as homes, because this effort *will increase street homelessness*. This approach targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in a city with unlivable rent costs and constant systemic gentrification. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

The San Francisco local government so often prides itself in protecting its citizens, yet here we are, facing another oppressive and shortsighted piece of legislation. Before public school budget cuts I held a position in social work at SFUSD. I worked primarily with elementary-aged students who need extra social/emotional support. During that time, I met several families who had lived or were currently living in vehicles. Their security to a parking space allowed these children a slice of consistency -- something they would lose completely entering the publicly "provided" houseless resources in San Francisco. For some of the families, their vehicular homes worked as a stepping stone to finding more permanent housing. If this proposal comes into fruition hundreds of folks will be put on an excessively long shelter waitlist where they may or may not acquire temporary housing (872 people in 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the adult shelter waitlist).

It devastates me that the SF local government is allowing for such heinous legislation to be considered, especially without any resources to support the aftermath. Especially, especially during a time in which we *have* to be caring for each other.

Please **reject** Lurie's proposed proposition to place a 2-hour restriction on RV parking. It is ignorant, inconsiderate, and will only further jeopardize families in San Francisco.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Mags

From: gmclaughlin415@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:28:26 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From: Renee Robledo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:27:42 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Renee
California

From: Raya Steier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:20:42 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Raya
California

From: Eric Brenner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:20:35 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Eric
California

From: Matthew Coleman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:10:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Hi,

My name is Matthew, and I am asking that you please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Matthew

Matthew
California

From: Caroline Wolber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:50:58 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Caroline
California

From: Jessica Bay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:27:36 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jessica
California

From: Michela Garber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:22:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Michela
California

From: ian.wilson1414@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:12:40 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From: Kevin Moses
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:11:15 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Kevin
California

From: Julia Gleason
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:44:30 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Julia
California

From: Jade Numair
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:31:23 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Jade Numair

Jade
California

From: Stacy Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:04:55 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Stacy
California

From: diana.valentine@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:34:58 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

As a service provider in SF for the past 25 years, I have worked with many adults and families with severe medical issues that live in their RV. Banning their RV's would push them to the street and immediately endanger their lives.

Please stop this active harm to our SF community.

California

From: Gabriel Rivas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:24:42 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I live in Park Merced right next to several RVs. They are perfectly fine neighbors (some with very friendly and adorable dogs I love to meet), and I have no complaints about them. I don't see how they are any different from the people that live in the apartments and townhomes around me. They're just human beings doing their best to survive. We need a real fix to the problems that forced them out of their homes and into their vehicle, not some futile attempt to sweep the problem under the rug like a toddler trying to avoid cleaning their room.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Gabriel
California

From: Luka Dowell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Vote No - the RV Ban will make homelessness worse for everyone
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:24:34 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

The 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking is cruel and counterproductive. Street homelessness, i.e. people sleeping in tents and doorways, is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to homelessness. Many more people are less-visibly unhoused: in motels, couch surfing, or in RVs like many of my unhoused neighbors. Forcing people out of RVs will only shift them into more precarious circumstances.

It's time we stopped approaching homelessness by pushing people around like inanimate objects, with this "out of sight out of mind" ethos. These are PEOPLE we're talking about - literally our neighbors! They are voters, workers, and members of society who deserve as much respect as anyone else. By towing someone's RV - their home - you're confiscating whatever small comforts they've managed to hold onto. You're pushing them further into poverty, and into a more visible/precarious/dangerous version of homelessness. They lose documents and other important possessions. There are not enough shelter beds, so they go from sleeping behind closed doors to sleeping on the sidewalk. How would you feel if that happened to you? Seriously, stop and think about how you would feel if this happened to you.

With raids on immigrants in our community increasing, this proposal could not come at a worse time for our vulnerable neighbors. I say "our neighbors" because I live quite close to several of these RVs. I walk by them every day. I have never had any issue with them. They are my neighbors just as much as anyone who lives in the nearby apartments. To me, this proposal to tow away my neighbors' homes is an attack on my community. It's hard to have faith in my representatives when they threaten harm to my neighbors. With what little faith I have left, I'm writing to urge you to be empathetic. These aren't just talking points. This is a plea for mercy.

The only answer to homelessness in SF is providing real solutions - providing housing. Without that, you're making the problem worse for everyone. Please vote no on the RV ban.

Luka
California

From: Jessica Schelz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:21:50 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jessica
California

From: Anneke Kanalakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:20:45 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. It will not reduce homelessness - there are over 850 on the waitlist for family shelters, please invest in those resources instead. You do not need more parking revenue either. The proposed restriction not only targets those in RVs, who are peacefully trying to live their lives (often families trying to work and stay sheltered in the best way they can without going into a system that separates them and restricts their autonomy), in addition, more shuffling from the few places they can park now will also worsen the parking situation of all residents, and disheartens my community members. This proposal demonstrates the cities own failure to serve its underserved people by penalizing them for doing their best in lieu of safe and accessible affordable housing options for families.

This ban would harm immigrants and only increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without more housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Anneke
California

From: jasmine martin-partovi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:20:24 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

jasmine

From: Jane Potter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:15:11 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Jane
California

From: Misha Patel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:06:06 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Misha
California

From: Maya Koneval
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:03:22 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Maya
California

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	33 Letters regarding File No. 250655
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:40:00 PM
Attachments:	33 Letters regarding File No. 250655.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 33 letters regarding File No. 250655.

> **File No. 250655:** Ordinance 1) amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; 2) amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; 3) urging SFMTA to develop a fair review process and to develop further exceptions to the two-hour restriction as may be needed to support the public interest; 4) amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; 5) amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and 6) affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor, Melgar, Mandelman, Engardio, Dorsey, Sherrill)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Samantha Alvarez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:36:57 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident of the inner sun's writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter and private property while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I've lived on Winston Ave. And other RV heavy streets and I can tell you people aren't choosing to live in RVs on a whim, it's a direct result of the billionaire take over of this city pushing out the working class. If you want to revitalize the city the mayor and supervisors need to work for the real residents of San Francisco living in those RVs not a transient 1% with no ties or investments in San Francisco.

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting their tenants isn't how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn't have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn't poverty tows. I'm asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Samantha Alvarez

Samantha
California

From: ccusic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Cusic
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:26:27 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Catherine and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

People are living in RVs because it is their best option, not because they prefer it to living in a house. I delivered free groceries during CoVID and was amazed at the number of homeless youth living in RVs.
This city needs what it has always needed. Affordable housing. My attorney daughter cannot afford to live here.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Catherine Cusic
San Francisco, CA 94110-3109

From: Isaiah Machin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 11:07:36 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Isaiah Machin

Isaiah
California

From: saragreenwald2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sara Greenwald
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:43:00 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Sara and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

As your constituent, I'm surprised that you signed on to this perhaps well-intentioned but ultimately foolish approach. The only van dwellers who can comply are groups of several adults. In a small family with no shelter but the RV, someone has to get up every 2 hours to move the van. That is torture. It's understandable that people with homes nearby find the crowding, dirt and noise of an RV area distressing and are concerned for their property value, but that must be resolved by providing hygiene and other services, not by jailing the adults and putting the children in foster care-where?

The real problem is that the city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ms. Sara Greenwald
San Francisco, CA 94115-3392

From: Ivan.Rhudick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ivan Rhudick
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:28:50 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Ivan and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mr. Ivan Rhudick
San Francisco, CA 94118-2307

From: Ivan.Rhudick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ivan Rhudick
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:28:07 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Ivan and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mr. Ivan Rhudick
San Francisco, CA 94118-2307

From: Cpc94118@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Cundari
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:25:42 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Christina and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ms. Christina Cundari
San Francisco, CA 94121-1216

From: sdaniel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Daniel
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:24:44 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Sharon and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sharon Daniel
San Francisco, CA 94107-2380

From: SFSU ALUMNI Angelica Bellavia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:22:33 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

I lived in an RV out of survival for four years of my life before attending San Francisco State University has a transfer student. To not have a stable place to park your RV puts a death sentence on those who are physically vulnerable or even disabled. Physically vulnerable people in the disabled who live in RVs would become houseless if their RVs were to be towed which further puts them at risk for even worse homelessness. It's a shame that the city where I received my degree could do such a thing Jeet citizens, especially for being a historicallyprogressive city. This is disgusting and is clearly an attack on those who live on RVs. People who live in RVs are already trying to make do and have a safe place to live. You should be focusing on creating affordable housing and removing Airbnb's that private equity and small landlords open to take advantage of San Francisco citizens and incoming visitors.

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people’s RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

SFSU ALUMNI Angelica
California

From: checkitoff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Aron
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:06:08 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Laura and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Ms Laura Aron
San Francisco, CA 94110-6432

From: plwinks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Winks
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:05:18 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Patricia and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Patricia Winks
San Francisco, CA 94118-1437

From: anna.asebedo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anna Asebedo
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:04:45 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Anna and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Anna Asebedo
San Francisco, CA 94131-3012

From: erica@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Erica Wang
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:04:41 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Erica and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mrs. Erica Wang
San Francisco, CA 94112-2263

From: liliana.soroceanu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Liliana Soroceanu
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Reject RV Ban - Will Increase Homelessness
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:03:01 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

My name is Liliana and I live in San Francisco. Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking. This ban will harm people across the city and increase homelessness.

There are over 1,400 people living in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing homelessness. If their RVs are towed, they will lose their only form of shelter. This approach punishes those who use RVs as their homes in an attempt to force them to leave. People living in RVs have families, work, and community here. To force them to uproot because residents with houses don't like the aesthetic of RVs is cruel.

The city does not have enough affordable housing and shelter beds. There are 295 families on the family shelter waitlist and 471 individuals on the single adult waitlist. People living on the streets or in shelters desperately need resources.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or leave the city en mass. Enacting a ban like this will only push people onto the streets and deeper into instability. This will waste SFMTA and SFPD resources for no gain.

Instead of banning RV parking, focus on providing real housing solutions. This ban helps no one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Dr. Liliana Soroceanu
San Francisco, CA 94116-1735

From: feliciaanntacto@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:44:32 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

California

From: Jenna Bess
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:58:04 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Jenna

Jenna
California

From: maryn erney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:49:55 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Maryn Erney

maryn
California

From: Rida Fayyaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:34:03 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Rida

Rida
California

From: Ron Nieberding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:13:56 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Ron
California

From: Ron Nieberding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:13:44 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Ron
California

From: Catherine LaPerche
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:10:03 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Catherine LaPerche

Catherine
California

From: Catherine LaPerche
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:10:03 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Catherine LaPerche

Catherine
California

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:38:52 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Nick
California

From: Guppy Kwon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:37:55 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Guppy
California

From: Guppy Kwon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:37:54 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Guppy
California

From: kellyfine12@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:32:48 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Kelly Fine
San Francisco Supervisorial District 11

California

From: kellyfine12@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:32:44 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Kelly Fine
San Francisco Supervisorial District 11

California

From: Kathy Tran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:37:23 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,

Kathy
California

From: Claire Young
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:59:44 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Claire
California

From: Guled Muse
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on the RV Ban - Will Harm Immigrants and Increase Street Homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:24:15 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV and large vehicle parking. This ban will harm immigrants and increase street homelessness. This proposal comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government. Vulnerable RV residents, many of whom are immigrants, will be made even more vulnerable by this ban. They will be more exposed to law enforcement and could end up on the street if their RVs are towed.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter and all their possessions, including documents that are important for housing and employment. The City lacks the housing and shelter beds to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into street homelessness and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions and recognize that it will take more than a year to house all RV households, especially if the City is also going to house those already on the streets and in shelter. Housing heals, towing and displacement helps no one.

Guled
California

From:	Elle Chen
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject:	Opposition to Large and Commercial Vehicle Parking Restrictions File No. 250655
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:22:15 AM
Attachments:	Opposition to RV Ban SF BOS 07.09.25.pdf

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

Good morning San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Attached you will find Drug Policy Alliance's opposition to Large and Commercial Vehicle Parking Restrictions File No. 250655 being heard this morning.

For more information on our position on this bill, please contact me or Grey Gardner, California State Director, ggardner@drugpolicy.org.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Elle C. Chen, MSc | Policy Manager
Drug Policy Alliance
Pronouns: they.them.theirs
Phone: 510.679.2309 | Email: echen@drugpolicy.org
X | Instagram | Facebook
www.drugpolicy.org

From: Isabella Spangher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:20:31 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Isabella Spangher

Isabella
California

From: Quinn Martinez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the Mayor's RV Ban - Give Us Safe Parking Sites and Affordable Housing!
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:00:07 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to urge you to strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on RV parking. The proposed policy will seize poor and working class people's only shelter while offering utterly inadequate services in return.

RVs are homes, especially for immigrant families, elderly, and disabled San Franciscans. Over 1,400 City residents live in their vehicles, including 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness. There are 872 people on the family shelter waitlist and 471 people on the adult shelter waitlist. We know as well that existing shelters are often temporary and inadequate. Is it surprising that people would prefer to live in an RV over sleeping on a gymnasium floor where you get kicked out at 7AM?

I am especially dismayed that the Mayor's proposed plan doesn't include safe parking sites. Many elderly residents have been living in their vehicles for decades. It's unrealistic to think that they'll be willing to give up their homes in six months - or a year. Safe parking sites are a proven strategy to meet people where they're at while addressing complaints about street conditions. The City's own failure to run a safe parking site at Candlestick Point isn't an excuse, especially when there's a for-profit RV park operating within SF city limits. If Oakland, San Jose, Fremont, Palo Alto, and Union City can all run safe parking sites affordably, why can't we?

For people living in their vehicles who are ready to move immediately to housing, what's included in the current plan is equally inadequate. There are far more people at risk of having their homes towed than there are housing vouchers, and many of the vouchers being offered are given at the expense of people staying in congregate shelters. An RV or vehicle, while not perfect, is permanent, private housing, and forcing people to give that up in exchange for temporary rental support is unproductive, cruel, and contrary to established research.

I'll conclude by expressing my absolute opposition to the punitive enforcement strategy in the Mayor's plan, which includes as much funding for signage and tows as it does for helping people. The 2-hour RV parking ban, unlike the housing vouchers, is permanent, and underscores the real purpose of the Mayor's plan: reducing visible poverty, no matter who it hurts. I know SF officials frequently use the existence of 'vanlords' to justify their support for towing policies. While I want to eliminate exploitative landlords as much as anyone, evicting

their tenants isn’t how we solve this problem. The best way to address predatory behavior is to remove opportunities for predation - by providing permanent, affordable housing.

No one is saying SF shouldn’t have a plan for helping our neighbors living in their vehicles, but the solution isn’t poverty tows. I’m asking that you push Mayor Lurie and his oligarch pals to come up with a real strategy for addressing this issue, one that includes safe parking sites and real, permanent housing offers for everyone who needs them.

Sincerely,
Quinn Martinez

Quinn
California

Item 31

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 8:37:00 AM
Attachments:	SFPGA.Letter.Bd.of.Supes.Budget.Cttee.7.9.25.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance regarding File No. 250604, which is Item No. 2 on today's Budget and Appropriations Committee agenda.

> **File No. 250604:** Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: rharrisjr1@gmail.com <rharrisjr1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:44 AM
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON)

<alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Madland, Sarah (REC) <sarah.madland@sfgov.org>; Ketcham, Dana (REC) <dana.ketcham@sfgov.org>; Summers, Ashley (REC) <ashley.summers@sfgov.org>; TomSmith@pgatourtpc.com; dan.burke@tftsf.org; markduane65@yahoo.com; dapro@sbcglobal.net; twohsieh@gmail.com
Subject: Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,
Above attached is letter dated July 9 submitted by SF Public Golf Alliance for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.
Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.
Thank you.

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
826 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-2726
Phone: (415) 290-5718
info@sfpublicgolf.org

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE

826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA 94117 • 415-290-5718

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally. Comment of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (the "SFPGA") is a San Francisco-based, 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing over 7,000 public golfers of all ages, genders, persuasions, ethnicities, cultures and economic backgrounds.

The proposed legislation captioned "Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 250604[1], set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee, includes significantly increased greens fees plus maintenance & cost recovery fee surcharges which would collectively raise costs 16% to 51% for resident public golfers at the various courses – with much bigger price hikes for non-residents and visitors. The Resident Senior weekend rate is eliminated completely.

For additional perspective, the current $136 cost for a San Francisco Resident card represents a more-than 50% cost increase since 2020. The Pacifica Resident card (for play at Sharp Park only) would jump over 300%, from $91 to $300.

The SFPGA, along with the 7,000-plus public golfers we represent, recognizes the need to respond to the serious budgetary pressures impacting our city. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed fee and surcharge increases unfairly overburden the public golfers—without improving the courses and without addressing the deeper, systemic challenges that continue to undermine the long-term sustainability of municipal golf in our city.

As discussed in our previously submitted letter to Your Committee dated June 23, 2025[2], San Francisco's public golf courses suffer from persistent challenges, including:

- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses

[1] File No. 250604, Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses . . Golf Fees Generally https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918BB87CA

[2] SFPGA Letter to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 23, 2025, at p. 2 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Dp4d9zOt7Oebg0K7ENv86DNINVYkXO92/view?usp=drive_link

Our June 23 letter also points to the need for improved transparency from the Rec & Park Department. As to the Cost Recovery Fee and Maintenance Fee surcharges in the File No. 250604 legislation, we respectfully request descriptions and accountings of the Department's (i) costs to be "recovered" and fees collected, and (ii) uses made of surcharge fees collected.

For the SFPGA and our fellow-and-sister public golfers to support further greens fee increases and additional surcharges, we urge all concerned that the issues briefly outlined in our June 23 letter to Your Committee be addressed as part of a strategic plan, developed collaboratively among all San Francisco golf stakeholders – public golfers, Labor, SFRPD, current course management, and potential philanthropy. San Francisco's public golf courses have been, since John McLaren's day, among the City's priceless community recreational assets – for which we are all stewards for future generations.

Finally, we welcome the Rec & Park Department's public commitment in its June 20, 2025 Presentation to Your Committee, to "maintaining affordable access to municipal golf for all." [3] We share that commitment, we are optimistic about the future of public golf in San Francisco, and we look forward to working together with all stakeholders to make it happen.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, General Manager Phil Ginsburg, Dana Ketcham, Sarah Madland, Mayor's Budget Office, Board of Supervisors, Recreation and Park Commission

[3] Dept. of Recreation and Park, Presentation to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 20,2025, p.10 https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14312821&GUID=DDBE23FE-754A-474F-912F-A790055A1336

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding File No. 250604
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:51:00 AM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding File No. 250604.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding File No. 250604, which is Item No. 2 on today's Budget and Appropriations Committee agenda.

> **File No. 250604:** Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Lily Achatz
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing June 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:00:44 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing June 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Please see my attached letter for the Committee's June 25 Hearing on the Rec-Park Budget._Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9th hearing.

Thank you, Lily Achatz

Good Afternoon Supervisors. My name is Lily Achatz and I work with the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance. I am also the President of the Harding Park Women's Golf Club (which we restored 4 years ago after 25 year dormancy) and The SF Women's Golf Alliance. We collaborate and partner with all the SF municipal women's and men's clubs to create affordable golf events and opportunities for public golfers. We also support Junior organizations like First Tee, Youth on Course and US Kids that rely on public golf. I am here on behalf of my community at Harding Park/Fleming, Sharp Park, Lincoln, Gleneagles and Golden Gate golf courses. We oppose the Recreation & Parks Department proposed and unfair budget cut of 6M, 1/3 of the golf budget which would put our golf courses at risk and/or make golf unaffordable. This would greatly affect minorities, women, veterans, low-income families/individuals, and juniors.

I have witnessed, first-hand, the mental and physical health benefits golf provides especially to those in our clubs who suffered greatly during Covid and also our friends of PGA Hope, *the non profit that introduces golf to veterans in order to enhance their mental, social, physical, and emotional well-being*. Golf has kept some of our veterans off the streets. Golf is a physically and mentally healthful outdoor activity, and is unusual among sports because it can be played together by people of all kinds -- all abilities, ages, genders, persuasions, incomes and backgrounds. And it is a great place to meet and be with people. Our community is more diverse culturally and spans across all age groups, more than any sport in San Francisco. In light of what is happening today with ICE, we must protect our diversity. As a bi-racial Samoan-German female born in San Francisco, I feel more comfortable playing on our public courses. Our public golf community can't afford to pay thousands of dollars to join a country club and it would be a disservice to keep us out of this social sport that brings people together and in many cases creates a future, a dream. Five years ago, I met 10 year old Hazel who was playing at Sharp Park, her home course. Her whole family was there and she became a regular at almost all of the SF municipal courses and still is. But now, she is part of the PGA Junior League, won the US Kids World Championship at Pinehurst and has her name on the Peter Hay Junior Trophy at Pebble Beach. She is on track to get a golf scholarship for college and one day become a professional golfer. It would have been impossible for her to achieve what she has without our public golf courses.

Please help us in preserving what John McLaren, Godfather of Recreation & Parks, believed in. He built the City's first courses -- Lincoln, Harding and Sharp Park -- in the early 1900's – personally hiring the architects, planting the trees, and overseeing construction. Protect his Scottish tradition of golf as public recreation – not hidden behind private walls. And protect the dreams of generations to come.

LILY ACHATZ
2070 Pacific Avenue #303
San Francisco, CA 94109
415-905-0050
lilyachatz@gmail.com

From:	Mike Ippolito
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Mike Ippolito (mippolitosf@hotmail.com); Richard Harris Jr.; Lily Achatz; Ed Tseng; Gus Gomez de Segura; Matthew Lefkowitz; Smoot Phil (philsmoot@gmail.com); Steve Ashburner; Timothy Proschold
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:39:46 AM
Attachments:	HP Sup Letter 2025-07-09.docx

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m.
Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Above attached is a letter dated July 9 with my comments for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Mike Ippolito
President Harding Park Golf Club

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Budget & Appropriations Committee

Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

I am a public golfer, President of the Harding Park Golf Club, and member of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (SFPGA). Our club and its 140 members are not in favor of the proposed legislation captioned **"Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses… Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 2506041**, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee.

We do support the plan proposed by the SFPGA to perform a more wholistic approach to funding and maintaining our great golf properties. Please see the letter from the SFPGA by Richard Harris dated July 9.

Let's get all parties together to meet and come up with creative and long lasting solutions that produce affordable and great golf and other recreational activities for the residents of San Francisco.

Thank-you, .

Mike Ippolito

President, Harding Park Golf Club

From:	Grant Ingram
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:42:03 AM
Attachments:	SFPGA.Letter.Bd.of.Supes.Budget.Cttee.7.9.25.pdf

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

As a supporter of affordable public golf, I support the sentiments in the attached letter from the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance dated July 9. Please consider the letter as representing my comments for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Grant Ingram

106 Point Lobos Avenue, SF, CA 94121

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE

826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA 94117 • 415-290-5718

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally. Comment of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (the "SFPGA") is a San Francisco-based, 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing over 7,000 public golfers of all ages, genders, persuasions, ethnicities, cultures and economic backgrounds.

The proposed legislation captioned "Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 250604[1], set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee, includes significantly increased greens fees plus maintenance & cost recovery fee surcharges which would collectively raise costs 16% to 51% for resident public golfers at the various courses – with much bigger price hikes for non-residents and visitors. The Resident Senior weekend rate is eliminated completely.

For additional perspective, the current $136 cost for a San Francisco Resident card represents a more-than 50% cost increase since 2020. The Pacifica Resident card (for play at Sharp Park only) would jump over 300%, from $91 to $300.

The SFPGA, along with the 7,000-plus public golfers we represent, recognizes the need to respond to the serious budgetary pressures impacting our city. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed fee and surcharge increases unfairly overburden the public golfers—without improving the courses and without addressing the deeper, systemic challenges that continue to undermine the long-term sustainability of municipal golf in our city.

As discussed in our previously submitted letter to Your Committee dated June 23, 2025[2], San Francisco's public golf courses suffer from persistent challenges, including:

- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses

[1] File No. 250604, Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses . . Golf Fees Generally https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918BB87CA

[2] SFPGA Letter to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 23, 2025, at p. 2 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Dp4d9zOt7Oebg0K7ENv86DNINVYkXO92/view?usp=drive_link

Our June 23 letter also points to the need for improved transparency from the Rec & Park Department. As to the Cost Recovery Fee and Maintenance Fee surcharges in the File No. 250604 legislation, we respectfully request descriptions and accountings of the Department's (i) costs to be "recovered" and fees collected, and (ii) uses made of surcharge fees collected.

For the SFPGA and our fellow-and-sister public golfers to support further greens fee increases and additional surcharges, we urge all concerned that the issues briefly outlined in our June 23 letter to Your Committee be addressed as part of a strategic plan, developed collaboratively among all San Francisco golf stakeholders – public golfers, Labor, SFRPD, current course management, and potential philanthropy. San Francisco's public golf courses have been, since John McLaren's day, among the City's priceless community recreational assets – for which we are all stewards for future generations.

Finally, we welcome the Rec & Park Department's public commitment in its June 20, 2025 Presentation to Your Committee, to "maintaining affordable access to municipal golf for all." [3] We share that commitment, we are optimistic about the future of public golf in San Francisco, and we look forward to working together with all stakeholders to make it happen.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, General Manager Phil Ginsburg, Dana Ketcham, Sarah Madland, Mayor's Budget Office, Board of Supervisors, Recreation and Park Commission

[3] Dept. of Recreation and Park, Presentation to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 20,2025, p.10 https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14312821&GUID=DDBE23FE-754A-474F-912F-A790055A1336

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	10 Letters regarding File No. 250604
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:43:00 PM
Attachments:	10 Letters regarding File No. 250604.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 10 letters regarding File No. 250604, which is Item No. 2 on today's Budget and Appropriations Committee agenda.

> **File No. 250604:** Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	H Duffy
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Madland, Sarah (REC); Ketcham, Dana (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); TomSmith@pgatourtpc.com; dan.burke@tftsf.org; markduane65@yahoo.com; dapro@sbcglobal.net; twohsieh@gmail.com; Richard Harris; Ginsburg, Phil (REC)
Cc:	Richard Harris Jr.
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:50:36 AM
Attachments:	Letter to SF Board of Supes 7_2025.docx

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,
Please find the attached letter dated July 9 for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute it to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.
Thank you.
Best,
Helen

--
Helen Duffy

(415) 269-0988

Helen M. Duffy
39 Mangels Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94131

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget & Appropriations
Committee Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.

Dear Chair Chan and SF Supervisors,

As a Board member of the Sharp Park Business Women's Golf Club (SPBWGC), I am writing to oppose the proposed fee increases for public golf in San Francisco.

Our club was incorporated in 1955 and has been continuously active since that time, making us one of the longest-running women's golf clubs in the region. Our members represent a diverse group of women ranging in age from their 20's to their 80's.

Our club members have actively promoted golf among women and youth in San Francisco for decades, including volunteering for First Tee, serving on the San Francisco Mayor's Women's Golf Council, and coaching girl's junior varsity teams at local high schools.

Affordable golf in the Bay Area promotes access to healthy outdoor recreation for residents from a range of income levels, including those on fixed retirement incomes. And although the exercise golf offers is important, the SPBWGC has also created a community of women from across the Bay Area who not only love the sport, but who truly care for and support one another through difficult times.

I understand that we are facing challenging financial circumstances. I also understand that in the face of so many other grave challenges that have emerged over the last seven months, appealing to you to keep fees for recreation might seem unimportant. But I maintain that having affordable access to recreation – and the community it creates – could not be more important than it is right now.

I hope that you will consider this as you make decisions about the proposed budget.

Sincerely,

Helen Duffy

From:	Patrick Goggin
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Richard Harris
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing June 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:30:24 AM
Attachments:	image001 (1).png

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

Dear Chair Chan, Supervisors and Mayor Lurie--

I am the President of Gleneagles Golf Club, having discovered golf and the City's thriving public golf community at the age of 50. Golf substantially supported my mental health during the Covid years and beyond. I have watched with great interest as golfers have increasingly embraced public golf at Gleneagles -- one of the more interesting tracks in a wonderful setting and an incredible bay view from the clubhouse.

Earlier this year, we were shocked at the news that Rec and Park was proposing to eliminate its $6mm public golf subsidy, essentially privatizing the courses and pricing out much of the diverse population reliant upon the City's public courses to regularly play the game they love.

Today, I applaud the Board for jettisoning that proposal in favor of reasonable fee increases. On that note, in adopting increased fees, I urge the Board to bear in mind all socio-economic levels to ensure that ALL City residents can afford to play public golf in San Francisco.

Moreover, I urge the Board to direct Rec and Park to use its significant Golf Maintenance Fund on better maintaining all SF public courses. Properly allocating these funds for maintenance would reduce the need for additional surcharge fees on top of increased greens fees. The attachment to this email indicates that in 2024-2025 Rec and Park raised about $3.4mm for maintenance but only actually spent $704k on maintenance. Rec and Park must be better stewards of the revenues they generate which would reduce the need for increased fees.

Finally, in order for our excellent public courses to continue in perpetuity I respectfully request the Board to do what it can to guide Rec and Park to reasonably negotiate long-term leases with existing operators (or others) at Gleneagles, Lincoln, and Sharp Park. Doing so will provide operators with stability and the ability to develop long term plans for improving the courses.

Thank you for your valuable time and the work you do.

Warm regards,

Patrick D. Goggin

___

Patrick D. Goggin, Esq.
Law Offices
pdgogginlaw@gmail.com
patrickdgoggin.com
415.312.0084

Confidentiality Notice: *The information contained in this transmittal, including any attachments, is privileged and confidential information and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If you are neither the intended recipient nor the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying or distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmittal is strictly prohibited.* If you have received this transmittal in error, please contact the sender *415.312.0084 immediately and delete this transmittal from any computer or other data bank. Thank you.*

2024-25 Golf Maintenance Fund

Expenditure and Revenue	Golf Courses	Actual as of 1/16/2025	Description	Year
Expenditures	REC Golden Gate Golf Course	89,152	Parking Lot, Outdoor Furniture	2024
	REC Harding Park Golf Course	115,000	Harding Gate	2024
	REC Lincoln Park Golf Course	81,328	Lincoln Golf Irrigation Con	2024
	REC Lincoln Park Golf Course	149,445	Lincoln Cart Paths	2024
	REC Sharp Park Golf Course	94,288	Sharp Golf Irrigation Con	2024
	REC Sharp Park Golf Course	174,175	Sharp Cart Paths	2024
Expenditures Totals		**703,388.00**		
Revenue	REC Golden Gate Golf Course	347,710		
	REC Harding Park Golf Course	1,639,116		
	REC Lincoln Park Golf Course	671,996		
	REC Sharp Park Golf Course	720,808		
Revenue Total		**3,379,630**		

From:	ed tseng
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); TomSmith@pgatourtpc.com
Subject:	Budget & Appropriations Hearing - Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:41:55 AM

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

Dear Chair Connie Chan and SF Supervisors,

I am a public golfer and member of the Harding Park and Lincoln Park golf clubs. I am not in favor of **"Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses… Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 2506041**, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee.

I support the plan proposed by the SFPGA to perform a more holistic approach to funding and maintaining our great golf properties. Please see the letter from the SFPGA by Richard Harris dated July 9.

Let's get all parties together to meet and come up with creative and long lasting solutions that produce affordable and great golf and other recreational activities for the residents of San Francisco.

Thank you,

Ed Tseng

Harding Park Golf Club

Lincoln Park Golf Club

From:	Butch Larroche
To:	Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); TomSmith@pgatourtpc.com; Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Fw: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:50:21 AM
Attachments:	Fee_Increase_Letter_2025-07-09.docx

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Above attached is a letter dated July 9 with my comments for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Butch Larroche

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Budget & Appropriations Committee

Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

I am a public golfer and member of the Sharp Park Golf Club and the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (SFPGA). I am not in favor of the proposed legislation captioned **"Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses… Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 2506041**, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee.

I am in support of the plan proposed by the SFPGA to perform a more wholistic approach to funding and maintaining our great golf properties. Please see the letter from the SFPGA by Richard Harris dated July 9.

Let’s get all parties together to meet and come up with creative and long-lasting solutions that produce affordable and great golf and other recreational activities for the residents of San Francisco.

Thank you,

Butch Larroche

From:	Russ Johnson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:18:45 AM
Attachments:	Fee_Increase_Letter_2025-07-09.pdf SFPGA.Letter.Bd.of.Supes.Budget.Cttee.7.9.25.pdf

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Above attached is a letter dated July 9 with my comments for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Russ Johnson

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Budget & Appropriations Committee

Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

I am a public golfer and member of the Harding Park Golf Club and the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (SFPGA). I am not in favor of the proposed legislation captioned **"Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses… Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 2506041**, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee.

I am in support of the plan proposed by the SFPGA to perform a more wholistic approach to funding and maintaining our great golf properties. Please see the letter from the SFPGA by Richard Harris dated July 9.

Let’s get all parties together to meet and come up with creative and long lasting solutions that produce affordable and great golf and other recreational activities for the residents of San Francisco.

Thank you,

Russ Johnson

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE

826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA 94117 • 415-290-5718

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally. Comment of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (the "SFPGA") is a San Francisco-based, 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing over 7,000 public golfers of all ages, genders, persuasions, ethnicities, cultures and economic backgrounds.

The proposed legislation captioned "Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 250604[1], set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee, includes significantly increased greens fees plus maintenance & cost recovery fee surcharges which would collectively raise costs 16% to 51% for resident public golfers at the various courses – with much bigger price hikes for non-residents and visitors. The Resident Senior weekend rate is eliminated completely.

For additional perspective, the current $136 cost for a San Francisco Resident card represents a more-than 50% cost increase since 2020. The Pacifica Resident card (for play at Sharp Park only) would jump over 300%, from $91 to $300.

The SFPGA, along with the 7,000-plus public golfers we represent, recognizes the need to respond to the serious budgetary pressures impacting our city. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed fee and surcharge increases unfairly overburden the public golfers—without improving the courses and without addressing the deeper, systemic challenges that continue to undermine the long-term sustainability of municipal golf in our city.

As discussed in our previously submitted letter to Your Committee dated June 23, 2025[2], San Francisco's public golf courses suffer from persistent challenges, including:

- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses

[1] File No. 250604, Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses . . Golf Fees Generally https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918BB87CA

[2] SFPGA Letter to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 23, 2025, at p. 2 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Dp4d9zOt7Oebg0K7ENv86DNINVYkXO92/view?usp=drive_link

Our June 23 letter also points to the need for improved transparency from the Rec & Park Department. As to the Cost Recovery Fee and Maintenance Fee surcharges in the File No. 250604 legislation, we respectfully request descriptions and accountings of the Department's (i) costs to be "recovered" and fees collected, and (ii) uses made of surcharge fees collected.

For the SFPGA and our fellow-and-sister public golfers to support further greens fee increases and additional surcharges, we urge all concerned that the issues briefly outlined in our June 23 letter to Your Committee be addressed as part of a strategic plan, developed collaboratively among all San Francisco golf stakeholders – public golfers, Labor, SFRPD, current course management, and potential philanthropy. San Francisco's public golf courses have been, since John McLaren's day, among the City's priceless community recreational assets – for which we are all stewards for future generations.

Finally, we welcome the Rec & Park Department's public commitment in its June 20, 2025 Presentation to Your Committee, to "maintaining affordable access to municipal golf for all." [3] We share that commitment, we are optimistic about the future of public golf in San Francisco, and we look forward to working together with all stakeholders to make it happen.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, General Manager Phil Ginsburg, Dana Ketcham, Sarah Madland, Mayor's Budget Office, Board of Supervisors, Recreation and Park Commission

[3] Dept. of Recreation and Park, Presentation to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 20,2025, p.10 https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14312821&GUID=DDBE23FE-754A-474F-912F-A790055A1336

From:	Jim Retzlaff
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations. Cttee. / Budget Hearing July 9, 2025 1:30 pm Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:01:56 PM
Attachments:	SF BoS Golf Fee & Surcharge Proposal 7-9-25.pdf

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Attached is my comment letter dated July 9, 2025 for the Committee's 1:30 pm hearing on the Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legistation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to the Committee members for the Committee's July 9, 2025 hearing.

Thank you,
Jim Retzlaff
San Francisco

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Budget & Appropriations Committee

Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 pm, Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

I am a public golfer in San Francisco. I discovered the joys of golf later in life and now play as often as possible. Golf is a wonderful activity that people of all ages and abilities play together. I play with random folks whom I don't know, and they are the nicest, most interesting San Franciscan's from all walks of life.

I started as a beginner at Fleming 9, became halfway decent, and now play at Harding Park. Green fees have risen sharply over the last few years. Prices are already high and raising them by the amounts proposed means I will no longer be able to afford to play our wonderful courses as often. Thus, the increased fees will cause me to contribute fewer dollars overall to the course and city, ultimately reducing revenue.

I strongly **urge you not to pass** the legislation Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Golf Course Fees Generally, file No. 250604, scheduled for July 9, 2025.

Sincerely,

Jim Retzlaff

San Francico

From:	Mike Wallach
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Comment for Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:04:05 PM
Attachments:	mwlettertoSFBudgetCommittee7-9-25.pdf

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Attached is my letter dated July 9 with comments and suggestions for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

These particular comments represent only my personal views as a long time resident and frequent patron of San Francisco's historic and beautiful municipal golf courses and not as a representative of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Mike Wallach
Director
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Web: SFPublicGolf.org
Twitter: @SFPublicGolf

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc.

Dear Chair Chan, District 3 Supervisor Sauter, and SF Board of Supervisors,

My name is Mike Wallach. I am a 40 year resident of San Francisco and 30 year resident in District 3. Although I am a member, supporter, and Director of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, my thoughts here are not representing the organization, but rather my personal perspective as an enthusiastic but bad golfer and long time frequent patron of San Francisco's beautiful and historic municipal golf courses.

I have reviewed the subject file and proposed Ordinance regarding the proposed increases in golf fees and would like to offer some comments for your consideration.

First, let me state I recognize there is a budget crisis facing the City and realize hard decisions must be made. The budget cut burden to City services will be borne by many, and public golfers are not an exception. I do not envy your difficult task in this fiscal environment. I am fortunate that I personally will not be overly impacted by the dramatic increase in fees but I know many who will. Among them are the disadvantaged and most financially vulnerable for whom partaking in our municipal gems bring a very significant health and enjoyment benefit to their lives.

I am a believer in the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance Mission of preserving eco-friendly affordable golf at the City courses to ensure that current and future generations of golfers can enjoy San Francisco's beautiful, historic, affordable courses. This is completely consistent with The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's Mission *"To provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks and preserve the environment for the well-being of everyone in our diverse community."*

There are inequitable, unreasonable, and unfair aspects to the proposed fee increases.

Some of the proposed increases in the golf Resident Card and course green fees run counter to the RecPark Mission. For some of the most financially vulnerable, including seniors on fixed incomes, students, and working class golfers significantly impacted by the current inflationary and tariff tax economic uncertainty, these fees are not affordable. They will be among our *"diverse community"* excluded from participating in the *"enriching recreational activities"* and *"well-being"* they enjoy playing the City's muni golf courses today.

The Pacifica Resident Card increase is punitive, unreasonable and counterproductive. The purpose of the Resident Card is to provide residents discounted fees on the golf courses. While San Francisco Residents enjoy the benefits of the Resident Card at all the San Francisco municipal courses, Pacifica Residents only enjoy the benefits at the Sharp Park Course, but at more than twice the price for the card

over SF residents. And this is on top of the increased green fees at Sharp which are among the most significant proposed increases of all the San Francisco muni courses. It seems likely that the double whammy of a massive increase in the Pacifica Resident Card which is only usable for paying significantly higher green fees at Sharp will result in a precipitous drop in both in both Pacifica Resident Card subscriptions and Pacifica resident rounds at Sharp Park. There is a realistic possibility that the unintended consequence will be little or no increase in revenue to RecPark and the City from Pacifica residents playing Sharp Park. Which would mean that the proposed increases completely fail to meet the objective of helping to address the City budget crisis.

My suggestions:

1. **Do not increase the Resident Card or course Green Fees for juniors, students and seniors.**
2. **Create a subsidized low income / asset tested lower cost Resident Card with reduced fees.**
3. **Make the Pacifica Resident Card fee consistent with the SF Resident Card fee.**
4. **Seriously consider the concerns and suggestions of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance as outlined in their letter of July 9, 2025.**

Thank you for your consideration of my comments and suggestions.

Mike Wallach
Bad Golfer
999 Green Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94133

From: slandi50
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Greens fee increase
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:24:55 PM

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

Please honor Harding Park GC President Mike Ippolito's request to address the Board regarding fee increases for public golfers.

Respectfully

Steve Landi

Sent from AOL on Android

From:	Patrick Hanley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Budget and Approp. Cttee / Budget Hearing July 9, 1:30 p.m. Agenda 2/ Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:56:53 PM
Attachments:	Fee_Increase_Letter_2025-07-09.docx SFPGA.Letter.Bd.of.Supes.Budget.Cttee.7.9.25.pdf

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Attached is a letter dated July 9 with my comments for the Committee's July 9, 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.

Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute it to Committee members for the Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thanks,

--Patrick

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Budget & Appropriations Committee

Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally.

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

I am a public golfer and member of the Harding Park Golf Club and the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (SFPGA). I am not in favor of the proposed legislation captioned **"Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 2506041**, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee.

I support the SFPGA's plan to take a more holistic approach to funding and maintaining our great golf properties. Please see Richard Harris's letter from the SFPGA dated July 9.

Let’s get all parties together to brainstorm creative, long-lasting solutions that produce affordable, great golf and other recreational activities for the residents of San Francisco.

Thank-you,

Patrick Hanley

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE

826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA 94117 • 415-290-5718

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget & Appropriations Committee
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally. Comment of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (the "SFPGA") is a San Francisco-based, 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing over 7,000 public golfers of all ages, genders, persuasions, ethnicities, cultures and economic backgrounds.

The proposed legislation captioned "Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 250604[1], set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee, includes significantly increased greens fees plus maintenance & cost recovery fee surcharges which would collectively raise costs 16% to 51% for resident public golfers at the various courses – with much bigger price hikes for non-residents and visitors. The Resident Senior weekend rate is eliminated completely.

For additional perspective, the current $136 cost for a San Francisco Resident card represents a more-than 50% cost increase since 2020. The Pacifica Resident card (for play at Sharp Park only) would jump over 300%, from $91 to $300.

The SFPGA, along with the 7,000-plus public golfers we represent, recognizes the need to respond to the serious budgetary pressures impacting our city. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed fee and surcharge increases unfairly overburden the public golfers—without improving the courses and without addressing the deeper, systemic challenges that continue to undermine the long-term sustainability of municipal golf in our city.

As discussed in our previously submitted letter to Your Committee dated June 23, 2025[2], San Francisco's public golf courses suffer from persistent challenges, including:

- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses

[1] File No. 250604, Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses . . Golf Fees Generally https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918BB87CA

[2] SFPGA Letter to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 23, 2025, at p. 2 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Dp4d9zOt7Oebg0K7ENv86DNINVYkXO92/view?usp=drive_link

Our June 23 letter also points to the need for improved transparency from the Rec & Park Department. As to the Cost Recovery Fee and Maintenance Fee surcharges in the File No. 250604 legislation, we respectfully request descriptions and accountings of the Department's (i) costs to be "recovered" and fees collected, and (ii) uses made of surcharge fees collected.

For the SFPGA and our fellow-and-sister public golfers to support further greens fee increases and additional surcharges, we urge all concerned that the issues briefly outlined in our June 23 letter to Your Committee be addressed as part of a strategic plan, developed collaboratively among all San Francisco golf stakeholders – public golfers, Labor, SFRPD, current course management, and potential philanthropy. San Francisco's public golf courses have been, since John McLaren's day, among the City's priceless community recreational assets – for which we are all stewards for future generations.

Finally, we welcome the Rec & Park Department's public commitment in its June 20, 2025 Presentation to Your Committee, to "maintaining affordable access to municipal golf for all." [3] We share that commitment, we are optimistic about the future of public golf in San Francisco, and we look forward to working together with all stakeholders to make it happen.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Harris

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, General Manager Phil Ginsburg, Dana Ketcham, Sarah Madland, Mayor's Budget Office, Board of Supervisors, Recreation and Park Commission

[3] Dept. of Recreation and Park, Presentation to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 20,2025, p.10 https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14312821&GUID=DDBE23FE-754A-474F-912F-A790055A1336

From: Patton Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Golf fees stop raising the golf fee.
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:41:37 PM

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

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding File No. 250604
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:34:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding File No. 250604.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding File No. 250604.

> **File No. 250604:** Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Rich Cortese
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Sharp park
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:32:32 PM

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

Sent from Rich's iPhone

Can you please consider the rate hikes they’re way too high I’m a born member on the short Park golf committee for the men’s club. We try to keep the expenses down. We’d appreciate you keeping our expenses down thank you.

From: Moses Gines
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Sharp Park
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:40:13 PM

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

Dear Budget Committee and Supervisors,

Above attached is a letter dated July 9 with my comments for the Committee's July 9 1:30 p.m. Hearing on Golf Cost Recovery and Fee Legislation.
Please include it in the Committee's Public Correspondence file and distribute to Committee members for Committee's July 9 hearing.

Thank you.

Moses Gines

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Item 32

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Thank You for Championing Procurement Reform
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:48:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Peter Birke regarding File No. 250192.

> **File No. 250192:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to 1) create a procurement legislative analysis authority for the City Administrator; 2) revise or create threshold dollar amounts for application of various contract requirements tied to the statutory Minimum Competitive Amount or statutory federal Single Audit Standard; 3) reorganize, standardize, and narrow Chapter 12F (relating to the MacBride Principles concerning Northern Ireland; including sunset of ordinance in 2035); 4) repeal Chapter 12J (relating to City business with Burma); and 5) narrow coverage of, and reduce meeting requirements in, Chapter 12L (relating to certain non-profit organizations receiving funds from the City); and amending the Labor and Employment Code to 6) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount, and update Article 131 (relating to nondiscrimination under City contracts; including sunset of ordinance in 2035) and repeal Article 132 (relating to nondiscrimination under City property contracts), while incorporating some of its provisions under Article 131; 7) reorganize, standardize, revise exemptions and waivers narrowing coverage, create a threshold dollar amount for application tied to the statutorily based Minimum Competitive Amount and update Article 151 (relating to City procurement of sweatfree goods; including abolition of the Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group and sunset of ordinance in 2035); and 8) repeal Article 141 (relating to salary history in the hiring process of City contractors), Article 142 (relating to criminal history in the hiring and employment process of City contractors), and Article 161 (relating to earned income credit forms for employees of City contractors). (Mandelman, Dorsey, Mahmood)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Peter Birke <peter.e.birke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 6:54 PM

To: MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ho, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.ho@sfgov.org>; Ha, Anh (BOS) <anh.v.ha@sfgov.org>; Mathewson, Melanie (BOS) <melanie.mathewson@sfgov.org>; Phelps, Brad (BOS) <brad.phelps@sfgov.org>
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Thank You for Championing Procurement Reform

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman (with CC to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors),

I'm writing to thank you for your leadership in introducing a bill to reform San Francisco's contracting and procurement system. As a D8 resident and member of the SF Abundant Leaders program, I deeply appreciate your commitment to addressing long-standing inefficiencies in how our City does business.

The changes outlined in the bill are both timely and necessary. For too long, small businesses —especially those owned by people of color and women—have faced steep barriers to accessing City contracts. By streamlining procurement processes and reducing unnecessary delays, this legislation has the potential to deliver real benefits to both local entrepreneurs and the communities they serve.

San Francisco has an opportunity to lead by example, demonstrating how government purchasing power can be a tool for both economic vitality and government effectiveness. Your bill marks a significant step in that direction, and I applaud your efforts in driving it forward.

Please continue to keep us informed as the bill progresses—I would be glad to support it publicly in any way I can.

Sincerely,

Peter Birke

12 Vicksburg St

San Francisco, CA 94114

Item 33

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding File No. 240967
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:12:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding File No. 240967.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 Letters regarding File No. 240967.

> **File No. 240967:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or "e-bike") incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment. (Peskin, Preston, Melgar, Mandelman, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Carol Brownson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:32:43 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://eBikeSF.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkMjNhZTRkM2RjMTQ0ODc0ZTc4MzFjOTAwZmVhZjI4ODo3OmM1ZmQ6MDZkNzY3MWM2OGQ2MDg0ZmFjZDkyNDdlZmM2ZDFiMTkwMzUwYTM1MzE2ODIzNjNjZmEyNWRiYTJhODJhNWYwZjp0OlQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Carol Brownson
cdbrownson@gmail.com
2309 California Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Margaret Dominguez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:23:38 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://eBikeSF.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpjOGEyODU5ZjM4OTNjMDk0ZDQ0M2RjNzZkZmQ5MGQxNDo3OjYzODQ6Mml1NGE2MTNkZmFlZDA1NTZlMzU1ZTBjMGFhNmQ2OTJjNTIxMjVhODZkNWY1NDE4N2QxMGZkNTNhZmRkNmRhNjp0OlQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Margaret Dominguez
maggied89@gmail.com
1750 Silliman St.
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Anne-Reed Arnaudo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:17:00 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://eBikeSF.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo1MWNhOTFiMWZiMmEyZjk4ZTRlMDM3ZWMzNzQwODFiYzo3OjRiZjQ6YTJjNDZmNTI4ZmFmNDdlMjkxOWIzYWE1MzcxNjdkZWVhODJiM2MzODQ5MGIzZTM5MWQwZmEzMGZlN2JhMTFkODp0OlQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Anne-Reed Arnaudo
aangino@gmail.com
129 15th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

Item 34

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	14 Letters regarding File No. 250487
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:17:00 PM
Attachments:	14 Letters regarding File No. 250487.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 14 letters regarding File No. 250487.

> **File No. 250487:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the City to approve one new homeless shelter, transitional housing facility, behavioral health residential care and treatment facility, or behavioral health specialized outpatient clinic (collectively, "Covered Facilities") in each Supervisorial District by June 30, 2026, and prohibiting the City from approving a Covered Facility that would be located within 1,000 feet of another Covered Facility unless the Board of Supervisors waives the 1,000 foot rule by Resolution based on a finding that approving the Covered Facility at the proposed location is in the public interest. (Mahmood, Walton, Dorsey, Sauter, Fielder, Melgar)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Sam Damore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:10:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Sam Damore

Email: sddamore@gmail.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

From: shaunasmalleds@gmail.com on behalf of Davina Small
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject: SOMA Resident: Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:04:00 PM

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

Dear Brent, Supervisor's Dorsey and the Budget & Finance Committee,

I'm reaching out this afternoon as a resident of SOMA San Francisco to express my unwavering support for Supervisor Mahmood's **Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance**.

There are several things that go without saying. Homelessness is an urgent issue for the city and I like most residents understand the need for long-term sustainable solutions. The day-to-day impact that not only homelessness, but public and prevalent drug use has on the residents of Soma, is well documented. We certainly have held our share of supportive solutions, be it housing (transitional, permanent, shelters) or injection sites. Soma is also home to 5 schools, 4 of which are charter/private, as this district is also largely residential.

Since the approval process for sites shifted to the Mayor's office, four out of five newly announced shelters have been placed in Western SOMA. This concentrated approach continues to burden one neighborhood disproportionately and limits choice and dignity for those the shelters are meant to serve.

I support this ordinance because it encourages all districts to participate in addressing homelessness, while also adding sensible spacing guidelines—such as preventing facilities from being placed within 1,000 feet of each other. Currently, there are three supportive housing sites in a one block radius from my home. This new ordinance would bring much-needed relief to already over-saturated areas like SOMA.

Please support this important step toward citywide equity. I urge you to vote **yes** on the ordinance and help ensure that no one neighborhood is required to shoulder the burden alone.

Sincerely,
Shauna Davina Small
Soma West Resident - Sumner & Clementina

From: David Singer
To: DorseyStaff (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Susanna Singer
Subject: Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:37:35 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Dorsey

We are writing as residents of SOMA San Francisco to express my strong support for Supervisor Mahmood's **Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance**.

We need to pull together as a city to solve the city's problems. All neighborhoods benefit from effective services, and the whole city benefits when we solve problems together. Treating some neighborhoods as containment zones breeds division at a time when we need unity. Many services do not introduce problems into neighborhoods, and it is unreasonable to reject all services because of ungrounded fear that they will.

Services should be spread out and placed in appropriate neighborhoods, so that the goals of the service can be best achieved. It's unhelpful to place housing for those in recovery in a neighborhood with a lot of bars and nightlife, for example. We all benefit from the diversity of the city, and it's more helpful to place people where they will have diverse, helpful, neighbors, and not a zone heavily populated with people like themselves.

We support this ordinance because it encourages all districts to participate in addressing homelessness, while also adding sensible spacing guidelines—such as preventing facilities from being placed within 1,000 feet of each other.

Please support this important step toward citywide equity. We urge you to vote **yes** on the ordinance to help ensure that no one neighborhood shoulders a disproportionate share of the burdens.

Sincerely,
David and Susanna Singer
Howard Street

singer@mac.com

From: Barbara Dwyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 11:42:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Barbara Dwyer

Email: montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

From: Max Chang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 9:39:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of SF and a homeowner/resident in West Soma for the last 5 years, I wanted to write my support for the Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance.

I understand why SOMA is a desirable place for affordable housing but at the same time, there must be measures in place to prevent "total exploitation" of that area. Local businesses are already struggling a lot and the growth of new businesses seems lagging.

The addition of further affordable housing creates further stress on the local businesses, and even if done correctly, creates public perception problems which also harms local businesses. This in turn, impacts the quality of life and attractiveness of our neighborhood to residents.

This new initiative to impose some limitations sounds like a great step in the right direction. SF is at its best when all districts of SF are attractive places to live and do business in.

Thanks,
Max Chang

From:	Matthew Jones
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date:	Saturday, July 5, 2025 4:51:15 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Dorsey and Board,

I'm writing as a resident of SOMA San Francisco to express my strong support for Supervisor Mahmood's **Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance**.

Our city must address homelessness with urgency, but also with fairness. Since the approval process shifted to the Mayor's office, four out of five newly announced shelter sites have been placed in Western SOMA. This concentrated approach burdens one neighborhood disproportionately and limits choice and dignity for those the shelters are meant to serve.

I support this ordinance because it encourages all districts to participate in addressing homelessness, while also adding sensible spacing guidelines—such as preventing facilities from being placed within 1,000 feet of each other. This would bring much-needed relief to already over-saturated areas like SOMA.

Please support this important step toward citywide equity. I urge you to vote **yes** on the ordinance and help ensure that no one neighborhood shoulders the burden alone.

Sincerely,
Matthew Jones
537 Natoma St.

From: Brendan Tobin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject: Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 8:00:29 AM

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

Dear Mayor Laurie And Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of SOMA write to express my full support for Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance.

SoMa is home to multiple elementary schools and children's facilities serving thousands of young students every day — Bessie Carmichael Elementary & Middle Schools, SOMACC, Yerba Buena Gardens Child Development Center, United Playaz, Gene Friend Recreation Center, Victoria Manalo Draves Park, Five Keys Charter School, Dolphin Stars Childcare, Studio Montessori, SOMA Daycare & Preschool, Presidio Knolls Elementary School, Apple Tree School, L'Academy Language Immersion Preschool & Infant Daycare, Ukrainian School of San Francisco. Children sent to these services are exposed to the highest density of homeless and drug treatment services in the City. These families and children deserve safe, calm, and stable neighborhoods. Excessive clustering of social services in SoMa and downtown disproportionately exposes SoMa's student population to safety risks, health hazards, and environmental stress.

Thank you,
Brendan

From: Soma West Neighborhood Association
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject: Soma Resident in Support of Equitable Shelter Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 6:13:37 AM
Attachments: Active-HSH-Sites-in-SOMA.png

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

Hello SF Officials,

I'm writing in support of the Bilal Mahmood's Equitable Shelter Ordinance. I live on Natoma Street between 6th and 7th Streets. I had the privilege of becoming a homeowner in the middle of the covid pandemic at the beginning of 2021. At the time, I was aware of some of the issues with Soma, particularly that most people advise "not to live there." Against prevailing internet wisdom, my wife and I decided to purchase a condo in West Soma to be in proximity to our respective offices. The ironic thing is that neither one of us would return to our physical offices, as they both closed permanently during covid.

Prior to moving to Soma we had lived in Cow Hollow, Pac Heights, and Lower Polk. We've been SF residents since the beginning of 2017. Moving to SOMA has opened our eyes quite a bit on the complexity of homelessness, drug use, and mental health issues in San Francisco, and the country more broadly.

We've also become incredibly involved in our community. I am one of the founding members of the Soma West Neighborhood association. It's through my involvement in the community that I've come to learn who my neighbors are and what type of people live in Soma. The people who live here are young professionals, families, artists, activists, children and families. What I appreciate most about this neighborhood is its diverse, kind, and thoughtful people.

Homelessness is present in all of San Francisco, but it's different in our neighborhood (as well as Tenderloin, Mission, Bayview, and the Castro) compared to the rest of the city. Honestly, it's something that I am jealous of for people who live in neighborhoods like Pac Heights, NoPa, and other more Western neighborhoods all bordering Golden Gate Park.



Soma in addition to having the highest concentration of supportive housing projects, also has the least amount of green space. Does this make sense?

I expect that this legislation will be passed without any real mechanism for enforcement of other districts doing their share, because the homelessness crisis is one of the issues being mandated to be resolved by SF voters and the mayor's supporters. So SF will get its 8000+ shelter beds, at the expense of certain neighborhoods that also happen to be the neighborhoods that have higher concentrations of people of color.

From a day to day perspective, this is the impact of the unhoused on people in my neighborhood:
- regularly cleaning up human waste. I've personally picked up human feces dozens of times in the past 2 years, because if I don't, who will? Definitely not DPW. The CBD will do this, but I'm not going to wait around when there is feces stinking up our entrance.
- being on higher alert walking through our neighborhood. I don't assume anyone is a danger to me, my wife, or my dog, but at the same time, "street" people are unpredictable, and require vigilance that is not required in other parts of SF. This adds a constant mental load moving through our neighborhood
- compassion fatigue from seeing all the people passed out or overdosing on the street. it's not possible for me as an individual to check on every passed out person. children should not be walking by this either.
- filthy streets. beyond the human waste, there is trash everywhere from people discarding things, rummaging through stolen trash bags (ironic because there aren't trash cans)

Will adding more homeless shelters/beds to the neighborhood improve any of the above? Will it make it worse? Honestly it is hard to say, but if a neighborhood is going to be exploited for this purpose, at the very least it should be getting services and support commensurate. If there is going to be X million dollars spent in the neighborhood by HSH and non-profits supporting the unhoused, mentally ill, and drug users, there should be at least X million dollars spent

supporting the residents that are making the neighborhood something greater than a place that is drug friendly and easy to camp out publicly. My demands would be the following for spatial equity:

- actually clean the streets
- add public bathrooms. Ocean beach gets a portable bathroom rolled in daily, but SOMA doesn't get something like this despite knowing that there is an unhoused population.
- add add trash cans (Paris has trash cans everywhere)
- subsidize small businesses so there are restaurants, retail, and other businesses that make the neighborhood thrive
- invest in green space

The public is becoming wise to what is going on, and things that don't make sense won't be allowed to continue. So what makes more sense, building all homeless infrastructure in a concentrated part of the city or distributing these services across the entire city? I can't control how the rest of the city votes, but at the very least, the neighborhoods that are already burdened should not be burdened more.

I'd also encourage you to not listen to the idiots that are telling you to build homeless shelters outside of the city. Their vision for tackling homelessness sounds like concentration camps. What does that look like?

- rounding up unhoused in SF against their will
- bussing them to a location outside of San Francisco

Homelessness needs to be tackled as a coalition of California cities, California as a whole, and ideally nationwide. SF cannot "solve" homelessness on its own. It is a state and national issue that is rooted in economics and unjust systems. The best thing that SF can do is try to be a model of good governance and set a vision for statewide and national policies to get people off the streets.

If you've actually read all of this, thank you for your time,
Adam Hong
https://www.somawestneighbors.org/

From: Dale Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:46:16 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Dale Wong

Email: dalewong108@gmail.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

From: Ronald Mungai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:07:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Ronald Mungai

Email: limo4usf@gmail.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

From:	Jen Schuetz
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Support for Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance
Date:	Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:01:26 PM

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

Hello:

I'm writing as a resident of SOMA San Francisco to express my strong support for Supervisor Mahmood's **Equitable Shelter Distribution Ordinance**.

Our city must address homelessness with urgency, but also with fairness. Since the approval process shifted to the Mayor's office, four out of five newly announced shelter sites have been placed in Western SOMA. This concentrated approach burdens one neighborhood disproportionately and limits choice and dignity for those the shelters are meant to serve.

I support this ordinance because it encourages all districts to participate in addressing homelessness, while also adding sensible spacing guidelines—such as preventing facilities from being placed within 1,000 feet of each other. This would bring much-needed relief to already oversaturated areas like SOMA.

Please support this important step toward citywide equity. I urge you to vote **yes** on the ordinance and help ensure that no one neighborhood shoulders the burden alone.

Sincerely,
Jen Schuetz
16-year resident of SOMA West

From: Bee Eprem
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 11:31:22 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Bee Eprem

Email: beezbeezz@yahoo.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

From: Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:59:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Lorna Walker

Email: sf.lorna@gmail.com

Subject: Vote No on Fiscally Irresponsible Ordinance to Mandate Homeless Shelters in Every District

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, but it is financially irresponsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more problems and safety issues for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It risks disrupting stable communities without meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness concentrated in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA. And I agree, SOMA, Tenderloin, Bayview should not bear the sole burden,

San Francisco officials would be wise to consider looking at land outside the city to provide shelter facilities, or at

I urge you to oppose District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

Rather I encourage you to expand the search and implementation of shelters and behavioral health centers to pockets of underutilized or lightly used

light industrial areas of San Francisco or outside of San Francisco. For example: Log Cabin Ranch (a 600 acre property the city of San Francisco owns in Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,
Lorna Walker

From: Chris Varen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject: Vote Yes - Urgent Need for Equitable Shelter Distribution in San Francisco
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:34:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

San Francisco needs more shelter beds, and it is fiscally responsible, especially now with a looming deficit, to mandate placing shelter facilities in every district. Implementing shelters and behavioral health centers throughout our city will only create more solutions and opportunities for everyday residents of San Francisco.

It helps build stronger communities by meaningfully addressing the root causes of homelessness right where we live, rather than continuing to concentrate the issue in areas like the Tenderloin and SOMA.

I urge you to support District 5 Supervisor Bilal Mahmood's proposed legislation that would require the city to approve at least one shelter or behavioral health center in each district in the next 18 months.

I encourage you to abandon the search for so-called "solutions" in pockets of underutilized or lightly used industrial areas outside of our actual communities. For example: The "Log Cabin Ranch", a 600-acre former juvenile **corrections** facility 50 miles outside of the city, is an absurd solution only suggested in bad faith, and would amount to placing people in an isolated pseudo-prison. Star Trek did a whole episode on San Francisco placing unhoused people in prisons, and it's not a good idea: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Past_Tense_(Star_Trek:_Deep_Space_Nine)

Sincerely,
Chris Varen

Item 35

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:45:00 PM
Attachments:	5 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 5 letters regarding File Nos. 250700 and 250701.

File No. 250700: Ordinance amending the Zoning Map to implement the Family Zoning Plan by amending the Zoning Use District Maps to: 1) reclassify certain properties currently zoned as various types of Residential to Residential Transit Oriented - Commercial (RTO-C); 2) reclassify properties currently zoned Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) to Residential Transit Oriented - 1 (RTO-1); 3) reclassify certain properties from Residential districts other than RTO to RTO-1; 4) reclassify certain properties currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Public (P) to Community Business (C-2); and 5) reclassify certain properties from Public to Mixed-Use or Neighborhood Commercial Districts; amending the Height and Bulk Map to: 1) reclassify properties in the Family Zoning Plan to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) change the height limits on certain lots in the R-4 Height and Bulk District; and 3) designating various parcels to be included in the Non-Contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Special Use District (SFMTA SUD); amending the Local Coastal Program to: 1) reclassify all properties in the Coastal Zone to R-4 Height and Bulk District; 2) reclassify certain properties to RTO-C and Neighborhood Commercial District; 3) designate one parcel as part of the SFMTA SUD; and 4) directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings under the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act of 1976. (Mayor, Sauter, Mahmood, Dorsey)

File No. 250701: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) create the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program to incent housing development through a local bonus program and by adopting a Housing Sustainability District, 2) modify height and bulk limits to provide for additional capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods, and to allow additional height and bulk for projects using the local bonus program, 3) require only buildings taller than 85 feet in certain Districts to reduce ground level wind currents, 4) make conforming changes to the RH (Residential, House), RM (Residential, Mixed), and RC (Residential-Commercial) District zoning tables to reflect the changes to density controls, and parking requirements made in this ordinance, 5) create the RTO-C (Residential Transit Oriented-Commercial) District, 6) implement the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit-Oriented Communities Policy by making changes to parking requirements, minimum residential densities, and

minimum office intensities, and requiring maximum dwelling unit sizes, 7) revise off-street parking and curb cut obligations citywide, 8) create the Non-contiguous San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Sites Special Use District, 9) permit certain Legacy Businesses to relocate without a conditional use authorization and waive development impact fees for those businesses, 10) make technical amendments to the Code to implement the above changes, and 11) make conforming changes to zoning tables in various Districts, including the Neighborhood Commercial District and Mixed Use Districts; amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code regarding the Board of Appeals' review of permits in the Housing Choice Program Housing Sustainability District; amending the Local Coastal Program to implement the Housing Choice-San Francisco Program and other associated changes in the City's Coastal Zone, and directing the Planning Director to transmit the Ordinance to the Coastal Commission upon enactment; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. (Mayor)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: rhett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rhett Currier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 9:31:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live near Dolores Park, I think plans for development need to include retention of public spaces that get natural light all day, like Dolores Park.

Sincerely,
Rhett Currier
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: gfpedler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gary Pedler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:38:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: This is a Draconian, sledgehammer method of addressing the housing crisis that will cause problems rather than solving them. It's essentially a blank check to developers to do virtually whatever they want. It will destroy the very qualities of the city that make so many people want to live here.

Sincerely,
Gary Pedler
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: douglasboszhardt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Doug Boszhardt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 8:42:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: The vastly expanded height limits will do huge damage to my district, the Marina. The Marina is a district that is currently very family friendly. Many families struggle with the idea of moving to Marin, to further build family structure, and educate their kids. We stayed, as it is a fantastic neighborhood, but seriously weighed that decision. The sun filled Italian courtyards in the Marina are very unique. A special feature of living here.

You can blow it up, but there will be negative consequences. These tall buildings will make families deciding whether to raise their kids in the city, the Marina in particular, more difficult, Moving to the suburbs when kids are young will be even more attractive at the margin. Ask Gavin who left Pac Heights for Marin.

But the Marina is more family friendly with its architecturally closed off Italian courtyards. Closed off to the street beautiful courtyards is a unique Italianate fortress design. They were built for sun filled gardens, and safety, as they can't be entered from the street. Great for raising small kids. I hear kid laughter in the courtyard…all weekend long.

These proposed tall buildings will ruin the sun access for the marina neighborhood. The profiteering developers are takers, and will make a lot of money stealing sun and Golden Gate Bridge views. The Pac Height elite don't care… maybe they will even be investors in the development. I'm sure they will. But it's a shame if it happens. Done in the name of families…but that's rediculous as all those new condos with views ripping off existing families…will be owned by people over the bridge. The new development will be Pied-it-teirs for suburbanites. They will be crash pads in the city for wealthy commuters, or Silicon Valley money. Their kids will be in the burbs. Such a shame. Poor planning and knowledge, understanding by planners …as there are other places in the city to do this. The Marina will be less desirable for those starting a family here…and have them staying here, as we did. We Marina families, and the city as it has been, will loose. Developers and their investors…will win. The new condo owners

are not families with young kids. But existing Marina families could leave, or just settle in Marin to begin with. To not understand this, is poor planning.

To summarize, the extreme proposed heights on Lombard is the issue, especially the massive heights on the east end of Lombard. I strongly believe current height restrictions allow for development Lombard nicely. Have at it.

Sincerely,
Doug Boszhardt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: gioconda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gioconda Corral
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:18:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Keep SF's perfect balance of city and nature feel in tact and please don't mess with its beauty and character. High buildings make more sense in South SF or in areas where tall buildings already exist. I am very concerned with over population, too much car traffic - air and noise pollution would be devastating affecting the feel of the city, the wildlife and nature.

Sincerely,
Gioconda Corral
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: patrica_inez@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patrice Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:31:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:
– Protect small businesses and renters
– Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
– Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
– Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens. Certain elected legislators seem to be working for developers and not for the people they represent. Please put a stop to this. I live in district one and what's been done for example to the great highway is a disgrace. We have no escape right now, but somebody's getting some money and I think some of the elected legislators from back east don't understand that what's different about California so we actually could be near the ocean in an equitable way such as driving
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94121

Item 36

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Antisemitism at the SF Pride Parade - SF response?
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:51:00 PM
Attachments:	att.qLBbLHSLvqNFI7EecZ2TCFiT48T_s5r3ZW8dicvO_9E.MP4

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Esfir Shrayber regarding antisemitism.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Fira Shrayber <to_fira@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:46 AM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>
Subject: Antisemitism at the SF Pride Parade - SF response?

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

Hello,

San Francisco has to address this .
What will be your response?

Thank you

Esfir Shrayber

Antisemitic radical group 'Gay Shame' chants "Death to the IOF (IDF)" & "Resistance is Justified" while holding "Dykes Hate Zionists" banner
DYKES
GAY SHAME
HATE
ZIONISTS

Item 37

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:54:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Ryan Kiracofe
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Administrator, City (ADM); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject: Why Haven't You Taken a Stand Against ICE Abductions in Our City?
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:59:18 PM

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

To the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and City Leadership,

I am writing out of deep frustration and urgency regarding the City of San Francisco's silence and complicity in ongoing ICE operations that are tearing families apart and targeting innocent members of our community. How is it that in a supposedly sanctuary city—one with a long history of progressive values—we are allowing federal agents to abduct our neighbors with impunity?

These actions are not hypothetical. They are happening here, now, under your watch. ICE operates without transparency, due process, or accountability, and yet your offices remain disturbingly quiet. Silence is not neutrality—it is endorsement. Every day you fail to speak out or take action is another day you allow fear, trauma, and injustice to spread in the very city you claim to serve.

What will it take for you to act? Where is the outrage? Where is the leadership?

I am demanding that each of you publicly and unequivocally oppose ICE operations in San Francisco, and use every tool available to resist federal overreach and protect our immigrant communities. That includes:

- Denouncing ICE raids and calling them what they are: state-sanctioned abductions.
- Refusing to cooperate or share information with ICE.
- Demanding accountability from any city agency that aids federal immigration enforcement.
- Making it absolutely clear that this city will not tolerate terrorizing its own residents.

Your constituents are watching. History is watching. And if you continue to stay silent, we will remember that, too.

Do your jobs. Take a stand.

Sincerely,

Ryan Kiracofe

From:	Cal L
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Administrator, City (ADM); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	ICE raids
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:15:16 PM

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

Recently viewed a viral video recorded just north of market street of an innocent abducted by unmasked ICE "agents" followed by a black town car running over citizens who rushed to aid. How can you help protect those being bullied by agents and the families ICE affects? This all seems like utter nonsense that could be prevented by louder city policies to protect your tax paying citizens.

-Dr Leingang

From:	A R
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Administrator, City (ADM); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Mayors silence on ICE
Date:	Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:00:20 PM

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

Hi Supervisors and Mayor,

I'm curious why the Mayor has stayed silent on the ICE activity in the city? Why does he very clearly not care about the Latino community in this city which make up a huge part of the city's culture and demographics? He can't even explicitly state Latinos are who are being targeted, that's how middle of the line he is. His silence is shameful and reveals his true stance on issues. He's a secret Trump supporter who hid his real stance on issues to mislead voters, get elected, and serve his wealthy, conservative supporters. It's a shame to see what the city has become, and as a Jewish woman, I'm ashamed of our mayor's silence. The attacks always start with one group with darker features, but it never stops there. Look at history. Never again.

Alexia Rotberg
1600 15th Street

Item 38

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: JFK
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 2:57:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Lisa Corley regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: LISA CORLEY <LISA.CORLEY.493119148@grassrootsmessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 7:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A compromise for John F. Kennedy Drive was reached in 2007 that allowed all users of Golden Gate Park to share the roads. It is time to reopen JFK Drive back to the way it was before COVID. The select few that are the most vocal are doing us all a disservice that want a reasonable compromise.

Please reopen JFK Drive like it was before COVID!

Regards,
LISA CORLEY
1335 Flicker Way
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Item 39

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Subject:	STOP spending our hard-earned tax dollars on these so-called non-profits!
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:15:53 PM

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

$160M in cuts is not enough!

https://missionlocal.org/2025/07/sf-nonprofit-budget-cuts-layoffs

Last year alone, San Francisco spent $1.5 billion on 745 nonprofits across the city, the majority of which cover homelessness and supportive housing.

https://www.sf.gov/data--san-francisco-nonprofit-contracts-and-spending

ENOUGH!

Cut those budgets by half, or 2/3rd, at least!

Where is all that money going? And for what results? Might this be 100M total or 500M, this waste still should raise eye concerns!

PLEASE, STOP spending our hard earned tax dollars on these so-called non-profits, whose incompetent, moronic, yet, quite sophisticated and corrupt “executives” keep on being paid up to half or 2/3rd of a million dollar a year, and living a life of travels, gifts and luxury.

We the people demanded change.

Where is that change?

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); DPW, (DPW); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Sawyer, Jason (POL); Board of Supervisors (BOS); SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org; Press Office, Mayor (MYR); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); SFPD Tenderloin Station, (POL); Nagano, Tomio (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Illegal homeless encampments, passed out crackheads, trash and filth, all over Lower Polk streets and alleys
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:11:21 PM

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

What's the latest on this matter?

Days, weeks, months, years pass on, and somehow, city hall keeps on allowing more and more of the same.

Time to act with courage, and get these peddlers, homeless, crackheads, drug dealers, and other criminals, out of here!

We cannot keep on having recurring encampments on our streets. We cannot keep on allowing passed out crackheads on our streets. We cannot keep on allowing littering, urine, feces, substance abuse and other scenes of chaos in our streets.

Where is the police?
Where are the car and beat patrols?
Where are the mass arrests and citations?

Clean up our streets, please!

> On Jun 16, 2025, at 20:00, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
>
> There is an unwarranted resurgence of illegal homeless encampments all over Lower Polk, Little Saigon and Tenderloin-adjacent neighborhoods.
>
> This includes any street, alley street or intersection located between McAllister St and California St, all the way from Franklin St to Hyde St.
>
> Specifically:
>
> - Austin St
> - Fern St
> - Sutter St
> - Hemlock St
> - Daniel Burnham Ct
> - Cedar St
> - Alice B Toklas
> - Myrtle St
> - Olive St
> - Eddy St
> - Ellis St

> - Willow St
> - Larch St
> - Elm St
>
> We just can’t have that.
>
> Cc’ing people outside of D3 since this still is a city-wide problem, not limited to this area.
>
> It is time you take this matter seriously. More than ever before.
>
> We are all paying enough property taxes and other kinds of taxes for our city services (SFPD, DPW, neighborhood CBD) to correctly be funded, for our sidewalks to be clean at all times, trash/urine/feces-free, and most importantly, crackhead and encampment free.
>
> Is that too much to ask?
>
> 1. Please, clean up our streets!
>
> 2. Remove all of these illegal encampments now.
>
> 3. Tow away all of these abandoned, graffiti covered RVs and vans.
>
> As for the repeat offenders, it might be time to consider citations and ultimately arrests.
>
> Thank you for making San Francisco a better place.
>
> JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	SFPD, Chief (POL); SFPD Tenderloin Station, (POL); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); SFPD Southern Station, (POL)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Subject:	Re: Illegal homeless encampments, crackheads, drug abuse, all over 6th St between Howard St and Market St
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:25:49 PM

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

How is that still an open issue, many months later?
Where is SFPD at night, when we need them the most? Where are the mass arrests? The citations?

Please clean up this mess!

We deserve to live in a clean and safe city! We've all waited long enough now… And this should be your top priority.

> On Feb 2, 2025, at 21:42, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Please clean up this out-worldly mess NOW.
>
> Use all means/force necessary.
>
> Thank you.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	SFPD, Chief (POL); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); FielderStaff; SFPD Mission Station, (POL)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Subject:	Re: Peddlers all over Mission St from 14th to 16th St
Date:	Tuesday, July 8, 2025 12:23:30 PM

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

Any updates?

Why are you allowing, here and elsewhere (such as Market and 6th St), these apocalyptic situations to happen in the first place?

Get those people out of here now.

The sidewalks belong to everybody, not peddlers, drug dealers, homeless, crackheads, and other criminals.

Thank you!

> On Jul 7, 2025, at 18:20, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Clean up this mess, please!
>
> <image0.jpeg>
>
>
>> On Jun 16, 2025, at 20:39, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
>> Dear Interim Chief of Police,
>>
>> What's the point of having a police mobile command on 16th/Mission to allow such a shit show right across the street, one or two blocks away?
>>
>> Time to make some arrests.
>>
>> Besides all of the trash and filth, we cannot keep on allowing and encouraging this type of illegal activity.
>>
>> Supervisor Fielder, why are you so silent, complicit even, on this particular matter?
>>
>> Please advise.
>>

From: Julien DeFrance
To: SFPD, Chief (POL); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SFPD Mission Station, (POL); FielderStaff
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Press Office, Mayor (MYR)
Subject: Re: Peddlers all over Mission St from 14th to 16th St
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:21:24 PM

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

Clean up this mess, please!

> On Jun 16, 2025, at 20:39, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
> Dear Interim Chief of Police,
>
> What's the point of having a police mobile command on 16th/Mission to allow such a shit show right across the street, one or two blocks away?
>
> Time to make some arrests.
>
> Besides all of the trash and filth, we cannot keep on allowing and encouraging this type of illegal activity.
>
> Supervisor Fielder, why are you so silent, complicit even, on this particular matter?
>
> Please advise.
>

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	5 Letters from Julien DeFrance
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:00:00 PM
Attachments:	5 Letters from Julien DeFrance.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 5 letters from Julien DeFrance regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Item 40

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	36 Letters regarding lobbying
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:06:00 PM
Attachments:	36 Letters regarding lobbying.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 36 Letters regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Barbara Fugate
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 1:46:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Barbara Fugate

Email: mousecollector@msn.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Johnson Eng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 12:59:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Johnson Eng

Email: jeng55@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Sharon Handa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:10:32 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Sharon Handa

Email: shandaf7@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: J. Barry Gurdin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:53:23 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: J. Barry Gurdin

Email: gurdin@hotmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 7:34:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Kathleen Gee

Email: kathygee606@att.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Susan Ford
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 6:06:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Susan Ford

Email: susn.ford103@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Devon Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 6:01:39 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Devon Johnson

Email: dpj@FangJohnson.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Stephen Voris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:36:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Stephen Voris

Email: sirovsez@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Peter Rapier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:10:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Peter Rapier

Email: peter.rapier@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 5:00:32 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: John Nulty

Email: john.nulty@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: jim connelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:36:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: jim connelly

Email: jim-connelly@comcast.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Shirley Fogarino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:08:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Shirley Fogarino

Email: scoopfoggy@prodigy.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Ken Vanos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 2:50:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Ken Vanos

Email: kenvanos@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Bill Alvarado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:43:19 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Bill Alvarado

Email: billalvarado@comcast.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ridiculous that the SFMTA with a shortfall of more than a couple of hundred million dollars, in the midst of a general fund overrun of about $800 million gave the BICYCLE coalition 1.5 million donation last year.

They should not be doing that. They should only be using their funds for DIRECT operations of the metropolitan transit for San Francisco. That means they should only be spending money for the immediate, direct, physical, and administrative needs of the metropolitan transit, which are the vehicles that are used to compose that transit operation.

The bicycle coalition has enormous overreach into the traffic and street use that the rest of the residence need to use daily . The BICYCLE coalition has a lot of tech money behind it, and they spread it all over the political machinery that runs the city. They must be immediately excluded from their financial, and political overreach into the rest of the street and transit operations. They only look out for themselves.

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and

Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Bill Alvarado, District 1

From: Rick Pospisil
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:39:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Rick Pospisil

Email: rpospisilmd@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Phyllis Love
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:19:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Phyllis Love

Email: gplov.1420@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Love

From: Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:58:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Frances Hochschild

Email: fhochschild@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Leslie Koelsch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:39:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Leslie Koelsch

Email: koelsch1886@comcast.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Stephanie Lehman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:29:32 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Stephanie Lehman

Email: slehman21@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Richard Rothman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:15:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Richard Rothman

Email: breaths.cramped.4n@icloud.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:07:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Hatun Noguera

Email: noguera@changes.world

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Laura Higbie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 2:38:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Laura Higbie

Email: lhigbie@hotmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Diane Sargent
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 3:25:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Diane Sargent

Email: diane.sargent@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Diane Sargent

From: Patrick Skain
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 7:38:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Patrick Skain

Email: patskain@att.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Brian Key
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 7:03:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Brian Key

Email: Brian@BrianKey.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Ronald Mungai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:14:03 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Ronald Mungai

Email: limo4usf@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Marina Dee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 4:22:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Marina Dee

Email: jazmin1557@aol.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Marina

From: Lorna Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:01:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Lorna Walker

Email: sf.lorna@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Lorna

From: Lefteris Eleftheriou
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:21:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Lefteris Eleftheriou

Email: lefteri28@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,
Lefteris Eleftheriou

From: Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:03:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Frances Hochschild

Email: fhochschild@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Anthony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 4:04:38 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Anthony Villa

Email: tvobsf@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely, Tony Villa

From: James Bowlby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:22:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: James Bowlby

Email: jbowlby00@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby the city, whether I agree with their proposals or not. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who are

not just pro-bike (which I am), but are anti-car, affecting seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life for many hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: K howard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:17:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: K howard

Email: kathyhoward@earthlink.net

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is unjust that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

Any trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as

San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA's contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Jackie Fletcher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 1:39:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Jackie Fletcher

Email: jfletch02@me.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Usha and John Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:25:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Usha and John Burns

Email: johnmburns48@yahoo.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Joe Cioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:15:15 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent: Joe Cioni

Email: joecioni@gmail.com

Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Joe Cioni

Item 41

From: Michael Lehr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff; FielderStaff
Subject: Support Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors – Stop Parking Tax!!
Date: Friday, July 4, 2025 7:44:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent	Michael Lehr
Email	metlehr@gmail.com
I live in	
Can you join in person to make public comment?	No, sorry!

Support Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors – Stop Parking Tax!!

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor, and SFMTA,

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's current proposal. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) on light mixed commercial/ residential areas and exclusive residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming.

I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets in District 5 in the Lower Haight specifically where we do not have a parking turnover issue. As well I believe in a more balanced program that is inclusive of cars, pedestrians, bikes and public transit users. SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA’s track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. Residents already pay for Area Parking Stickers; adding more meters is purely punitive.

Parking meters belong in commercial/residential areas where turnover is an issue and not in light mixed commercial/residential and exclusively residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

It’s time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From: Stephanie Catella
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; ChenStaff; FielderStaff
Subject: Support Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors – Stop Parking Tax!!
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:48:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent	Stephanie Catella
Email	drcatella@gmail.com
I live in	
Can you join in person to make public comment?	No, sorry!

Support Lower Haight Merchants & Neighbors – Stop Parking Tax!!

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor, and SFMTA,

San Francisco's economic recovery is lagging, partly due to anti-business, anti-resident policies like SFMTA's current proposal. The plan to install parking meters (or kiosks) on light mixed commercial/ residential areas and exclusive residential areas will only drive more people away from the city and shift consumer spending to places like Marin and South SF, where shopping remains convenient and welcoming.

I strongly oppose parking meters / kiosks on residential streets in District 5 in the Lower Haight specifically where we do not have a parking turnover issue. As well I believe in a more balanced program that is inclusive of cars, pedestrians, bikes and public transit users. SFMTA's focus should be on providing clean, safe, and reliable public transportation, not making life harder for residents and businesses. Policies like this threaten our small businesses, reduce quality of life, and alienate the very people who keep San Francisco vibrant.

A recent poll on Nextdoor showed 98% opposition to parking meters (kiosks) on residential streets. SFMTA’s track record of unpopular decisions—like those on Valencia, Van Ness, and Geary—has shown a disregard for the majority's concerns. Residents already pay for Area Parking Stickers; adding more meters is purely punitive.

Parking meters belong in commercial/residential areas where turnover is an issue and not in light mixed commercial/residential and exclusively residential neighborhoods. This policy will hurt local businesses, reduce foot traffic, and make living here more expensive. San Francisco should not be a city where people are charged just to be outside.

It’s time for our government to put constituents first and stop policies that make life in our city harder.

Thank you,

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Letters regarding residential parking meters
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:16:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding residential parking meters.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding residential parking meters.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Item 42

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject: FW: Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:19:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Werner Blumer regarding CA State Senate Bill 63.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Werner Blumer <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 8:38 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the City Attorney

From your constituent	Werner Blumer
Email	dart273@gmail.com
Subject	Prioritize MUNI Reform Before Considering New Taxes
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Senator Wiener and Assembly Member Stefani: As a resident of your district, I urge you to champion what San Franciscans are truly ready to support: a

functional, reliable, and efficient MUNI system that puts riders first.

We all want great public transit. But that means making accountability and operational reform a top priority—before asking voters to consider new, permanent funding sources like the regional sales tax increase proposed under SB 63.

Without a clear plan to restore public trust and improve basic service, this measure will fall into the same category as others that have failed at the ballot box. Voters want to say yes to transit—but only when they see results.

Please lead the way by ensuring any new funding is tied to measurable service improvements, fiscal responsibility, transparency and that the funds are reserved ONLY for MUNI transit services and nothing else. Let’s fix what’s broken before adding more to the bill.

Thank you for your service and for standing with San Franciscans who rely on this system every day.

Thank you,

Item 43

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Please install curbside protected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street to make Valencia safer for all people, better for business, and help people shift trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit…
Date:	Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:22:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Andrew Eljumaily regarding the installation of a protected bikeway on Valencia street south of 23rd Street.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Andrew Eljumaily <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please install curbside protected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street to make Valencia safer for all people, better for business, and help people shift trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit…

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

The Board of Supervisors ,

Alongside Streets Forward, I urge you to install curbside protected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street before the end of 2025 to make the street safer for all people, better for business, and help people shift trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit. Please work with Streets Forward to design and install protected bike lanes on this critical section of San Francisco's bike network.

The paint-only, unprotected bike lanes on Valencia Street south of 23rd are dangerous for all people and discourage people from shifting trips from cars to walking, biking, and public transit, which increases car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, roadway

fatalities and injuries, and climate emissions and decreases revenue for local businesses. We need curbside protected bikeways on Valencia Street south of 23rd Street now to increase safety for all people, benefit local businesses, and help people shift trips from cars to bikes, scooters, and other forms of sustainable transportation. The protected bike lanes should be curbside, have protected intersections, and not have any "mixing zones" and be installed before the end of 2025. This is an amazing opportunity for our city, and we need you to take action.

Thank you,

Andrew Eljumaily
andrew.eljumaily@gmail.com
2661 22nd Street, San Francisco, CA
San Francisco, California 94110